

Cell–extracellular matrix mechanotransduction in 3D

Aashrith Saraswathibhatla^{1,3}, Dhiraj Indana^{1,3} & Ovijit Chaudhuri^{1,2}✉

Abstract

Mechanical properties of extracellular matrices (ECMs) regulate essential cell behaviours, including differentiation, migration and proliferation, through mechanotransduction. Studies of cell–ECM mechanotransduction have largely focused on cells cultured in 2D, on top of elastic substrates with a range of stiffnesses. However, cells often interact with ECMs in vivo in a 3D context, and cell–ECM interactions and mechanisms of mechanotransduction in 3D can differ from those in 2D. The ECM exhibits various structural features as well as complex mechanical properties. In 3D, mechanical confinement by the surrounding ECM restricts changes in cell volume and cell shape but allows cells to generate force on the matrix by extending protrusions and regulating cell volume as well as through actomyosin-based contractility. Furthermore, cell–matrix interactions are dynamic owing to matrix remodeling. Accordingly, ECM stiffness, viscoelasticity and degradability often play a critical role in regulating cell behaviours in 3D. Mechanisms of 3D mechanotransduction include traditional integrin-mediated pathways that sense mechanical properties and more recently described mechanosensitive ion channel-mediated pathways that sense 3D confinement, with both converging on the nucleus for downstream control of transcription and phenotype. Mechanotransduction is involved in tissues from development to cancer and is being increasingly harnessed towards mechanotherapy. Here we discuss recent progress in our understanding of cell–ECM mechanotransduction in 3D.

Sections

Introduction

Mechanics of ECM components

Impact of ECM mechanics on cells

Cell–ECM interactions in 3D

Mechanisms of 3D mechanotransduction

Mechanotransduction in tissues

Conclusions and perspectives

¹Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA. ²Sarafan ChEM-H, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA. ³These authors contributed equally: Aashrith Saraswathibhatla, Dhiraj Indana.

✉e-mail: chaudhuri@stanford.edu

Introduction

Over the last several decades, it has been established that cell-intrinsic mechanisms are not sufficient to explain cell behaviours, with the microenvironment playing a critical role in many, if not all, cellular functions. Tissues consist of cells and extracellular matrix (ECM). The ECM is a scaffold that provides mechanical support and drives biological signalling in cells in tissues and has been recognized as a key aspect of the microenvironment that regulates cell behaviours and phenotype. As cells push and pull on ECM during various biological processes, the ECM initially resists these actions, as governed by ECM stiffness. Stiffness is usually described by the elastic modulus, which ranges from hundreds of pascals to several kilopascals in soft tissues such as brain, adipose and breast tissue, and up to tens of kilopascals in muscle^{1,2} (Fig. 1a). As cells increase the magnitude of their pushing and pulling, the ECM resistance often increases non-linearly or the ECM becomes stiffer, a behaviour described as nonlinear elasticity³. As cells sustain their pushing and pulling over time, the resistance of the ECM to cell-induced deformation relaxes due to stress relaxation, and the ECM undergoes creep under loading, as defined by the ECM viscoelasticity. Finally, permanent deformations can set in following release of forces by the cell due to ECM mechanical plasticity. These various mechanical properties of the cells impact intracellular signalling, transcription and phenotype through feedback from the ECM, whereby cells sense and respond to mechanical cues provided by the ECM – a process known as cell–ECM mechanotransduction.

Early studies of mechanotransduction focused on the impact of stiffness in 2D culture models on processes such as cell migration, proliferation, malignancy and differentiation^{4–8}. These established the concept of mechanotransduction and have proven to be relevant to various *in vivo* contexts. However, a 3D culture microenvironment is required to promote biologically relevant behaviours in many contexts^{9,10}. For example, a 3D microenvironment maintains a chondrogenic phenotype¹¹, distinguishes normal mammary epithelial cells from breast cancer cells, with only the normal cells forming growth-arrested organotypic acinar structures¹², supports fibrillar adhesions in fibroblasts that are observed *in vivo*⁹, boosts pluripotency of human embryonic stem cells¹³ and regulates cancer cell angiogenic capability¹⁴. Importantly, an emerging body of evidence indicates that mechanotransduction in 3D can differ from mechanotransduction in 2D. In this Review, we discuss recent advances in our understanding of cell–ECM mechanotransduction in 3D. First, we start by reviewing the mechanics of various ECMs, followed by the impact of ECM mechanics on various cell behaviours, such as cell spreading, migration and differentiation and other fundamental biological processes. Then, we describe the nature of cell–ECM mechanical interactions in 3D, and the corresponding mechanotransduction mechanisms mediated through cell membrane receptor proteins and the nucleus. We end the Review by describing the role of mechanotransduction in tissue development, disease and repair as well as the potential use of these findings towards mechanotherapy.

Mechanics of ECM components

In this section, we discuss major ECM components (Fig. 1b,c) that are implicated in tissue mechanics and cell–ECM mechanotransduction.

Type I collagen

Type I collagen (col-I) is ubiquitously expressed and is the most abundant protein in humans¹⁵. Col-I forms fibrils and then fibres that range from 50 nm to a few hundred nanometres in thickness and can be many

microns long. These fibres crosslink to form col-I networks, and reconstituted col-I gels are often used in 3D culture studies. The architecture and crosslinking of these networks differ substantially dependent on the tissue type. As cells bind to col-I fibres through integrin membrane receptors, heterodimers consisting of α and β subunits, with $\alpha 2\beta 1$ and $\alpha 1\beta 1$ integrins particularly implicated^{16,17}, these networks are central to many cell–matrix interactions.

Col-I mechanical properties are complex and are often characterized by various levels of stiffness, nonlinear elasticity, viscoelasticity and plasticity. Individual col-I fibrils exhibit a stiffness range of 300 MPa to 1.2 GPa, with the increase resulting from straightening and uncoiling of triple-helical structures of col-I (ref. 18). Reconstituted col-I gels are microporous and exhibit an elastic modulus on the order of tens to hundreds of pascals at the microscale to macroscale. Col-I networks initially resist external mechanical loading or deformation in shear or tension through resistance of individual fibres to bending, at low strain values, and then stretching of rotated and aligned fibres, at higher strains^{1,19} (Fig. 1d). This results in strain stiffening (nonlinear elasticity) with an almost order of magnitude increase in stiffness with strain (Fig. 1d), which depends sensitively on the length of the fibres composing the network^{3,20}. Like most natural ECMs, col-I networks are susceptible to degradation by proteases, particularly matrix metalloproteinases²¹.

Col-I networks are formed from a combination of weak crosslinks within fibres and between fibres, physical entanglements, and covalent crosslinks^{22,23}. Enzymes such as lysyl oxidase and advanced glycation end products facilitate covalent crosslinks between col-I fibres. Increased crosslinking density restricts bending deformation of the fibres, leading to increased stiffness. Under an applied mechanical stress or strain, unbinding of weak crosslinks within fibres or between fibres can lead to fibre lengthening or fibre reorientation and flow, respectively, giving rise to time-dependent viscoelastic responses such as creep or stress relaxation, and dissipating mechanical energy^{22–24}. Unbinding of the crosslinks leads to fibre lengthening and matrix flow, corresponding to translational movement of the fibres, which are irreversible and stabilized by reformation of weak crosslinks and are therefore associated with plastic or permanent deformation (Fig. 1d). Thus, in col-I, weak bonds whose breakage allows viscoelastic creep and stress relaxation also lead to plastic deformation, thereby linking viscoelasticity to plasticity.

Fibrin

Fibrin is the major constituent of blood clots. Fibrinogen is the precursor of fibrin, which is converted to fibrin fibres in the presence of thrombin and calcium during a blood clot. Fibrin forms a 3D branched fibrous network, with the network exhibiting weak physical crosslinks and covalent crosslinks, facilitated by factor XIII (refs. 22,23). Cells bind to fibrin through integrin receptors, $\alpha 3\beta 2$ specifically. Fibrin gels typically exhibit an elastic modulus on the order of hundreds of pascals to the low kilopascal range^{25,26}. At the macroscale, col-I and fibrin networks show similar mechanisms for stiffness, viscoelasticity, strain stiffening and plasticity owing to structural similarities^{3,22}. Fibrin gels are relevant for studying mechanotransduction in wound healing and also for various clinical applications.

Basement membrane

The basement membrane (BM) is a thin layer of ECM that separates epithelial and endothelial cells from the surrounding connective tissue, and also surrounds muscle and fat cells^{27,28}. It is nanoporous and the major constituents are typically laminins, found in a layer facing cells,




Fig. 1 | Tissue mechanics, ECM components and cell-ECM mechanical interactions. **a**, Stiffness and the half-life of stress relaxation for various soft tissues, and the range of those properties accessible with reconstituted extracellular matrices (ECMs) or synthetic ECMs (that is, hydrogels). Stress relaxation half-lives, which provide a measure of viscoelasticity, are defined as the time for the stress to relax to half its original value in response to a constant deformation. Synthetic ECMs, including alginate hydrogels and polyethylene glycol hydrogels, can be modified to mimic the physiological mechanics of soft tissues (see Box 1). **b**, Structural components of major polymeric (left) and non-polymeric (right) ECMs in tissues. **c**, An epithelial monolayer with basement membrane underneath, and a stromal cell surrounded by fibrous ECM proteins such as type I collagen (col-1) and elastin in the underlying connective tissue.

d, As cells interact with the ECM, these interactions are mediated by mechanical properties of the ECM, including stiffness, nonlinear elasticity, viscoelasticity and plasticity. As the cell pushes/pulls on the ECM, the ECM may resist the cellular force through bending and stretching of the ECM fibres (top left). With increased forces from the cell, the ECM may stiffen (that is, exhibit greater resistance) due to local alignment in fibres (top right). Over the time of force application, the ECM may undergo creep and stresses may relax due to detachment of weak crosslinks and fibre rearrangements (bottom right). When the cell detaches from the ECM, the ECM may retain permanent deformations resulting from reformation of weak crosslinks that lock in changes in fibre position and alignment (bottom left). Data were taken from refs. ^{1,40,52,84,122,135,199,268}.

and col-IV, found in a layer facing the stroma, with the two layers linked by entactin. The BM has a thickness on the order of hundreds of nanometres to several microns. Curvature of the BM surrounding the epithelial cells may give rise to interesting 3D cell–ECM interactions (epithelial structures are typically 3D). Cells bind to laminins through various β 1-containing integrins and α 6 β 4 integrin. Stiffness measurements of different BMs range from hundreds of pascals to tens of kilopascals, and the BM exhibits nonlinear elasticity²⁹. In tissues, cells may sense some combination of BM and col-I-rich stromal matrix mechanical properties, given the thickness of the BM³⁰. Nonetheless, increased expression of laminin-crosslinking proteins such as netrin 4 is associated with metastasis formation, thus indicating the role of stiffness of the BM in metastasis³¹. Reconstituted BM (rBM) matrices comprise a homogeneous nanoporous network formed from a mix of matrix proteins, including laminin-111 and col-IV, that is often used in 3D culture models of epithelia³².

Hyaluronic acid

Hyaluronic acid (HA) is a linear polysaccharide that is present in almost every tissue. HA forms connected or interpenetrating networks with other ECM components, such as col-I, as in skin or breast, or col-II and aggrecan, as in cartilage. Functionally, HA is a hydration molecule because of the large negative charge on its polymer chain that draws in water, and provides strong compression resistance. Cells bind to HA through the receptors CD44 and RHAMM. Although HA does not engage integrin receptors, it is implicated in mechanotransduction³³ and inducing specialized microtubule-rich protrusive structures known as microtentacles³⁴. Ageing and disease conditions, such as osteoarthritis or cancer, have been shown to correlate with changes in the molecular weight of HA, with higher molecular weight HA corresponding to pathology³⁵. However, the links between the molecular weight of HA and tissue mechanics and mechanotransduction are unclear. Although naturally extracted HA does not form a gel, HA can be chemically modified with various crosslinking groups to form elastic or viscoelastic gels³⁶.

Fibronectin

Fibronectin is a glycoprotein that is found in connective tissues and is often implicated in mechanotransduction³⁷. Each fibronectin protein has two arginine–glycine–aspartate (RGD) sequences which bind to several β 1-containing and β 3-containing integrins³⁷. The RGD cell adhesion peptide motif is used in many synthetic ECM-based cell culture studies^{38–43}. In addition to the RGD domain, which binds to cells, fibronectin also has col-I-binding domains, which leads to the formation of fibronectin–col-I composite networks⁴⁴. Unlike col-I and fibrin, fibronectin does not form a fibrous network by itself or in the presence of any external chemical factors. Instead, it relies on cells to mediate fibronectin assembly of individual fibronectin molecules into insoluble elastic fibres. In this case, cellular forces open up the cryptic domains in fibronectin molecules that mediate crosslinking, leading to network formation⁴⁵. Fibronectin coatings are used for 2D culture studies, whereas fibronectin-rich matrices can be formed by fibroblasts⁹. The RGD cell adhesion peptide motif is used in many synthetic ECM-based cell culture studies.

Other ECM proteins implicated in mechanotransduction

Beyond the components described so far herein, ECM consists of various other proteins, often referred to as the ‘matrisome’, with some of these components implicated in mechanotransduction. For example, tenascin C is implicated in mechanotransduction in the context of glioblastoma

brain cancer⁴⁶. Proteomics of breast cancer tissues revealed the novel role of other types of collagens, such as col-VI and col-XII, in breast cancer progression^{47,48}. Specifically, col-VI has been shown to increase cancer cell invasion, whereas col-XII is involved in reorganization in col-I, which may be associated with col-I remodelling during metastases.

ECM in tissues as composite networks

Although the mechanics of individual ECM components are important, tissues typically consist of multiple interacting ECM proteins, networks and cells with properties emerging from the interactions between the different components. Indeed, reconstituted col-I, fibrin and rBM have an elastic modulus ranging from tens to hundreds of pascals, and are much softer than many soft tissues (elastic modulus on the order of kilopascals). Recent studies have demonstrated that composites of HA and col-I gels exhibited increased stiffness and delayed strain stiffening compared with col-I-only gels^{49,50}. Further, the presence of elastin fibres, which are linearly elastic and highly resistant to degradation⁵¹, is thought to drive elastic recovery of many tissues following bulk deformation⁵². Additionally, chemical interactions of proteoglycans such as small leucine-rich proteoglycans and versican affect col-I organization⁵³. However, clear mechanistic insights into the design rules by which various matrisomal proteins impact col-I organization and overall tissue mechanics remain largely lacking.

In addition to the contribution of ECM components to ECM mechanics, cell interactions with ECMs can also lead to emergent mechanical properties. For example, fibroblast contraction of nonlinear elastic col-I gels leads to a stiffer matrix⁵⁴. Alternatively, a composite of closely packed cells and col-I exhibits compression stiffening similar to that of liver tissues, in contrast to compression softening of col-I gels⁵⁵. Taken together, these studies indicate the importance of understanding how ECM components interact together and with cells, as would occur in tissues, to govern the mechanical properties sensed by cells in mechanotransduction.

Tissue mimicking artificial ECMs for 3D culture

Reconstituted ECMs based on the natural ECM materials described so far herein have several limitations in terms of their use for 3D culture studies of mechanotransduction. Many of these are much softer than soft tissues, with an elastic modulus much less than 1 kPa (Fig. 1a and Supplementary Table 1). Further, stiffness, viscoelasticity, ligand density, and matrix pore size and architecture cannot be modulated independently, making it challenging to obtain definitive mechanistic insights into how these different properties influence cell biology. To address these shortcomings, engineered hydrogels with biologically relevant mechanics and signalling, and, importantly, independently tunable features, have emerged as powerful experimental platforms for 3D culture studies of mechanotransduction and have led to key insights into mechanotransduction as described in the subsequent sections. Box 1 describes some of these platforms in more detail.

Impact of ECM mechanics on cells

In this section, we survey some key trends regarding variation in specific ECM properties and their impact on various biological processes, focusing on adherent cells (Table 1).

Cell spreading


Mesenchymal and epithelial cells spread in 2D and 3D by taking on different morphologies, such as spherical, spindle-like or irregular shapes with different protrusions such as lamellipodia, filipodia and invadopodia.

Box 1

In vitro materials for 3D culture: choosing the right system

Here we provide a brief guide for choosing a 3D culture system for mechanotransduction studies, focusing on commercially available materials (see the figure). Natural matrices such as collagen, reconstituted basement membrane matrix (for example, Matrigel or Geltrex) and fibrin are easy to use and broadly mimic in vivo stromal matrix, basement membrane and blood clot environments, respectively, and are often used for 3D culture. These matrices tend to be soft, with an elastic modulus ranging from tens to hundreds of pascals, are inherently viscoelastic and degradable (Supplementary Table 1), and provide biologically relevant signalling⁵². Fibrin and collagen are microporous and have a fibrillar architecture, whereas reconstituted basement membrane matrix is nanoporous with a non-fibrillar architecture. Key limitations are that these materials have limited independent tunability of mechanical properties such as stiffness, viscoelasticity, fibre length and porosity, limiting their usefulness for studies of mechanotransduction. Synthetic and chemically modified natural hydrogel systems based on polyethylene glycol, alginate, agarose and hyaluronic acid provide much more tunability. Cell adhesion ligand (that is, arginine–

glycine–aspartate (RGD) peptide) density, stiffness, viscoelasticity and degradability can often be modulated independently of other parameters. These materials are usually nanoporous and non-fibrillar. However, these materials do not present full physiological signalling ligands, and tuning some properties requires more complex chemistries than are commercially available^{269–272}. Due to their high tunability, however, these materials are especially useful for translational applications or for mechanotransduction studies. Finally, in applications where tunability is desired but the engineered material is not sufficient to elicit the desired cell behaviour, interpenetrating networks of the engineered biomaterial with the relevant extracellular matrix (ECM) of interest can be considered. For example, interpenetrating networks of collagen and agarose²⁴⁷, reconstituted basement membrane matrix and alginate^{77,122}, and collagen and alginate²³⁵ (in various proportions) offer tunability of stiffness and in some cases viscoelasticity, while promoting biologically relevant behaviours. Readers are directed to various recent references for more information on choosing hydrogel platforms suitable for their needs^{108,273,274}.



In 2D culture, increased stiffness generally promotes cell spreading⁵⁶. In 3D, cell spreading proceeds in microporous ECMs that are sufficiently stiff⁵⁷, but is restricted in nanoporous ECMs. Covalently crosslinked elastic hydrogels typically restrict cell spreading in 3D^{42,58–60}. Contrastingly, viscoelastic hydrogels with sufficient stress relaxation or plasticity^{40,61,62}, or hydrogels that undergo degradation due to hydrolytic or protease activity⁴², allow cell spreading. Cell adhesion ligands, such as RGD cell adhesion peptide motifs, are required for cell spreading in both 2D and 3D, although very high ligand density diminishes cell spreading⁶³. Finally, ECM geometry, or structural features at the scale of tens to hundreds of microns, such as curvature and patterning of cell–ECM adhesion ligands, also impact cell spreading in both 2D⁶⁴ and 3D^{65,66} contexts.

Cell migration

Cell migration occurs during development, wound healing, immune trafficking and cancer metastasis^{58,67}. On 2D substrates of increasing stiffnesses, migration often follows a biphasic pattern, with higher levels of migration at intermediate stiffness values^{68–70}. Further, different

cells sense and migrate along positive and negative gradients of substrate stiffness – a process termed ‘durotaxis’^{69,71,72}. In 3D ECMs, various properties have been implicated in regulating cell migration. If the pore diameter of the ECM is greater than approximately 3 μm , cells can migrate robustly by squeezing through the pores^{59,73,74}, and migration can be guided by matrix architecture and alignment of fibres⁷⁵. In ECMs with smaller pore sizes, cells can generate channels for migration using either proteases to degrade the ECM^{42,73,76} or forces to mechanically open channels for them to migrate through if the ECM exhibits sufficient matrix mechanical plasticity, a property often linked to viscoelasticity^{77–79}. Notably, interstitial fluid flow, which is dependent on matrix porosity, has also been shown increase cell migration in 3D⁸⁰.

Matrix secretion

Cells not only degrade the ECM but also secrete nascent ECM^{81–84} in 3D culture. Hydrogel viscoelasticity regulates ECM production by chondrocytes⁸⁴ and mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs)⁸⁵, with cells forming a more interconnected cartilage-like or bone-like ECM in fast-relaxing

Table 1 | Impact of ECM properties on cells

Cellular process	ECM property						
	Stiffness	Viscoelasticity	Degradability	Nonlinear elasticity	Pore size	Ligand type and density	Geometry
Spreading	2D ^{63,69,234} ; + 3D ^{39,60,235,236} ; #	2D ^{95,96,237,238} ; + 3D ^{40,61,62,135} ; +	2D: ? 3D ^{42,60,103} ; +	2D: ? 3D ⁵⁷ ; +	2D: NA 3D ^{239,240} ; +	2D ^{63,97,241} ; # 3D ^{40,241} ; #	2D ^{64,89,242} ; # 3D ^{65,243} ; #
Migration	2D ^{68–71,191,244–246} ; # 3D ^{245,247} ; #	2D ²⁴⁸ ; + 3D ^{77,78} ; +	2D: ? 3D ^{42,73,76} ; +	2D: ? 3D ^{158,159} ; +	2D: NA 3D ^{73,74} ; +	2D ^{241,249} ; # 3D ²⁴¹ ; #	2D ²⁵⁰ ; # 3D ²⁵¹ ; #
Differentiation	2D ^{56,88,90–92} ; # 3D ^{39,40} ; #	2D ^{95,96} ; # 3D ^{39,40,61} ; #	2D: ? 3D ^{60,103,252} ; #	2D: ? 3D ¹⁰⁰ ; #	2D: NA 3D ²³⁹ ; #	2D ⁹⁰ ; # 3D ¹¹¹ ; #	2D ^{99,242} ; # 3D ^{65,253} ; #
Division	2D ^{105,254} ; + 3D ¹⁰⁵ ; +	2D ²³⁸ ; + 3D ¹⁰⁶ ; +	2D: ? 3D ^{103,255} ; +	2D: ? 3D: ?	2D: NA 3D: ?	2D: ? 3D ^{40,41} ; #	2D ^{64,256} ; # 3D ²⁵⁷ ; #
Apoptosis	2D ^{38,258} ; – 3D ¹⁰⁷ ; –	2D: ? 3D ⁴¹ ; –	2D: ? 3D: ?	2D: ? 3D: ?	2D: NA 3D ⁷⁴ ; –	2D: ? 3D ²⁵⁹ ; #	2D ⁶⁴ ; # 3D: ?
Tumour phenotype	2D ^{260,261} ; + 3D ^{118–122} ; +	2D: ? 3D: ?	2D: ? 3D ^{262,263} ; +	2D ²⁶⁴ ; + 3D: ?	2D: NA 3D ^{73,74} ; #	2D: ? 3D ¹²² ; #	2D ^{123,265} ; # 3D ^{124,214,265} ; #
Morphogenesis	2D: ? 3D ^{111,115,116} ; #	2D: ? 3D ^{41,114,115} ; +	2D: ? 3D ^{110–112,266} ; +	2D: ? 3D: ?	2D: NA 3D ²⁶⁷ ; #	2D: ? 3D ^{41,110,111} ; #	2D: ? 3D ⁶⁵ ; #
Matrix secretion	2D: ? 3D ¹⁸¹ ; +	2D: ? 3D ^{40,84,85} ; +	2D: ? 3D ^{82,83,86} ; +	2D: ? 3D: ?	2D: NA 3D ⁸³ ; #	2D: ? 3D: ?	2D: ? 3D: ?

Extracellular matrix (ECM) properties such as stiffness, viscoelasticity, degradability, nonlinear elasticity, pore size, ligand type and density, and geometry regulate various cell behaviours. A plus sign (+) indicates positive correlation, a minus sign (–) indicates negative correlation, a hash symbol (#) indicates a complex relationship and a question mark (?) indicates an unknown relationship that is still to be thoroughly investigated. Selected references for known impacts are included. NA, not applicable (ECM pore size is an important consideration in 3D but is not meaningful in 2D).

hydrogels. Similarly, ECM degradability allows chondrocytes to form a cartilage-like matrix⁸⁶. Overall, cells respond to ECM properties by secreting endogenous ECMs, resulting in a feedback mechanism that fine-tunes cell–ECM interactions.

Stem cell differentiation

Stem cell differentiation occurs during development and homeostasis, and controlling stem cell differentiation is a critical goal in many applications in regenerative medicine⁸⁷. Early 2D cultures studies showed that substrate stiffness regulates stem cell differentiation and illustrated the concept that matching native tissue stiffness promotes differentiation down that tissue-specific pathway in vitro in some stem cell types^{36,88}. For example, culture of MSCs⁵⁶ on stiff substrates, with a modulus approaching that of pre-mineralized bone, promotes osteogenic differentiation, whereas culture on soft substrates, with a modulus approaching that of adipose tissue, promotes adipogenic differentiation^{2,89,90}. Similar findings hold for differentiation of neural stem cells⁹¹. In other contexts, such as skeletal muscle stem cells, substrates with physiological stiffness can promote self-renewal⁹². Differentiation is also mediated by cell adhesion ligand density and type and viscoelasticity in 2D^{90,93–97}. Finally, 2D ECM geometry has been shown to influence MSC differentiation⁹⁸ as well as embryonic stem cell differentiation into mesoderm⁹⁹ via regulation of cell shape and cytoskeletal tension.

In 3D, some similar trends emerge, with viscoelasticity and degradation playing a more prominent role. In viscoelastic ECMs, soft substrates promote adipogenic differentiation and stiff substrates promote osteogenic differentiation of MSCs, similar to the findings from 2D^{39,40}. Osteogenesis is enhanced with faster stress relaxation⁴⁰, and stress stiffening of soft substrates can support osteogenic differentiation¹⁰⁰. In covalently crosslinked hydrogels, degradability is required for osteogenesis⁶⁰. Mechanical cues have been shown to impact fate in other stem cells populations in 3D, as well as monocyte

differentiation^{101–104}. Additionally, ECM architectural features such as fibre diameter and alignment have been shown to influence MSC differentiation⁶⁶.

Cell division

Every cell arises from a cell division event, and cell division underlies development and tumour growth. In 2D, increased stiffness promotes cell proliferation^{38,105}. In 3D, covalently crosslinked elastic matrices that are nanoporous restrict cell division, whereas faster stress relaxation in viscoelastic matrices, or increased matrix degradability, allows cell division and proliferation in nanoporous matrices^{40,103,106}.

Apoptosis

Apoptosis, or programmed cell death, is necessary for proper tissue homeostasis, and aberrant regulation of apoptosis is a hallmark of cancer. In 2D, soft substrates or confining geometries that limited spread area led to higher levels of apoptosis^{38,64}. In 3D, apoptosis is triggered during cell migration through confining pores⁷⁴ or through cell volume restriction in microwells in a stiffness-dependent manner¹⁰⁷, and is also modulated by matrix viscoelasticity⁴¹.

Morphogenesis

Morphogenesis is a complex multicellular process wherein cells self-organize to form 3D structures with specialized form and function¹⁰⁸. Although collective cell interactions are often emphasized in morphogenesis, there is increasing research emphasizing the role of the 3D microenvironment, including matrix degradability and viscoelasticity as central factors regulating morphogenesis in organoid models. Organoids are multicellular structures that capture specific features of organs. rBM matrices, which are widely used for organoid culture, are inherently viscoelastic and enzymatically degradable¹⁰⁹. Degradable gels promote apicobasal polarization and lumen formation in Madin–Darby canine kidney cysts¹¹⁰, support the viability and

formation of budded intestinal organoids containing differentiated cell types via symmetry-breaking mechanisms^{111,112} but restrict progenitor cell phenotype in neural tube cultures in vitro and in intestinal organoids^{111–113}. Viscoelasticity modulates lumen formation in organoid cultures of human pluripotent stem cells⁴¹, in endothelial vasculogenesis¹¹⁴ and during crypt budding in intestinal organoids¹¹⁵. Further, adhesion ligand density and type affect the formation of intestinal organoids¹¹¹ and lumens in Madin–Darby canine kidney cysts¹¹⁰ and human pluripotent stem cells⁴¹. ECM geometry has recently been shown to guide intestinal organoid formation and improve reproducibility of the organoids formed⁶⁵. Finally, stiffness controls cell survival¹¹¹ and tissue budding¹¹⁵ in intestinal organoids, and mimicking stiffness of native tissues increases liver organoid formation¹¹⁶.

Cancer progression

ECM mechanics regulate the emergence of a tumour phenotype¹¹⁷. In 2D and 3D, increasing substrate stiffness over the range detected during breast cancer progression promotes induction of a malignant phenotype in models of normal mammary epithelium^{118–122}. This same impact has been shown in other cancers as well, as we describe later. ECM geometry also influences cancer progression and collective invasion by controlling cell shape and, subsequently, cell phenotype in both 2D¹²³ and 3D^{84,124} microenvironments.

Cell–ECM interactions in 3D

Here we describe key features of cell–ECM interactions and force generation in 3D (Fig. 2), which ultimately underlie 3D mechanotransduction.

Cell–ECM adhesions

Cell adhesion signalling in 3D differs from that observed in 2D in several ways. Cells on 2D substrates form adhesions with ECM on only one surface, whereas cells can form adhesions in all directions in 3D, which impacts cell signalling. For example, mammary epithelial cells grow rapidly on 2D tissue culture plastic substrates but form growth-arrested, organotypic acinar structures in 3D culture in rBM matrix¹². Establishment of 3D matrix protein interactions, and not matrix per se, is sufficient for acinar morphogenesis as even on 2D rBM substrates cultured in media with the addition of soluble rBM proteins, thereby allowing cells to bind to these proteins in all directions, formation of acini is observed¹²⁵. How signalling activation across the entire cell surface leads to an outcome different from that resulting from signalling across one bottom surface remains unclear.

Further, the structure of adhesions differ in 3D relative to 2D. Cells in most currently used 3D hydrogels (with some exceptions) typically do not form large focal adhesions that are connected to robust actin stress fibres^{126–128}. In nanoporous hydrogels, which unlike fibrillar hydrogels are more homogeneous and have nanometre-sized pores, distinct adhesive complexes are often not observed, whereas in fibrillar matrices, fibrillar adhesions often form that colocalize with matrix fibres, and exhibit distinct phosphorylation of adhesion complex proteins such as paxillin and focal adhesion kinase (FAK) relative to canonical focal adhesions^{9,126,129}. By contrast, although adhesion complex formation also differs in 2D culture, substrates with sufficient stiffness and ligand density typically lead to the formation of focal adhesions. Further, in 3D, cells typically lack the thick contractile actomyosin stress fibres spanning the cell length that are characteristic of 2D cell culture on stiff ligand-dense substrates¹²⁶. Cells in 3D typically have an actin shell cortex at the cell membrane; however, the molecular architecture of the actin meshwork and actomyosin machinery in the

cell cortex remains unclear owing to limitations in the spatial resolution of microscopy for 3D culture.

Confinement

In 2D, cells can spread out on the substrate or change their volume unrestricted, whereas in 3D, changes in volume and shape are physically resisted, or confined, by the surrounding ECM (in addition, the ECM can restrict nutrient transport)¹⁰. The level of confinement is determined by ECM pore size¹³⁰ and properties such as viscoelasticity⁴⁰ and degradability⁶². A pore size of around 3 μm in elastic gels or structures with rigid pores serves as a barrier to cell migration because the relatively stiff nucleus cannot be deformed through smaller pores^{73,74}. However, physiological matrices are not elastic with rigid pores, but are typically viscoelastic⁵², exhibit mechanical plasticity^{52,131} and are degradable¹³², allowing expansion of pores by cellular forces and protease-mediated degradation. For example, degradation of ECM can convert even an elastic matrix to a viscoelastic fluid-like matrix¹³³, opening up pores for cell migration^{42,73,134} and promoting MSC spreading, force generation and differentiation⁶⁰. Viscoelastic and viscoplastic matrices dissipate mechanical stresses, undergo matrix creep under loading and exhibit irreversible deformations in response to force, allowing cells to generate space in the ECM, reducing confinement. Therefore, viscoelasticity and viscoplasticity enable cell spreading¹³⁵, cell volume expansion⁶¹, cell growth for division¹³⁶, proliferation of multicellular structures¹⁰⁶, deposition of matrix extracellularly⁸⁴ and cell migration independent of proteases⁷⁷. Thus, in 3D, cell confinement is governed by ECM pore size, viscoelasticity and plasticity, and degradability. Natural ECMs exhibit viscoelasticity, plasticity and degradability, allowing cells in vivo to remodel the matrix and potentially alter confinement.

Cell–ECM forces

In 2D and 3D, contractile or pulling forces generated by actomyosin machinery are a major modality of force generation, but several additional modalities of force generation become accessible to cells in 3D. 3D traction force microscopy techniques have enabled quantification of cell-generated forces by measuring matrix deformations and estimating stresses using theoretical models of matrix properties^{137–139}. These studies, and other studies using these techniques, show that cells exert contractile forces on ECMs through integrin-based adhesions in 3D. Indeed, it has long been known that fibroblasts cultured in a collagen gel will continuously contract the gel¹⁴⁰. Owing to the differing structure of both the adhesions and the contractile actomyosin machinery, the capabilities of contractile force generation in 3D likely differ from those in 2D, although the precise differences remain unclear.

In 3D, cells also generate protrusive forces. Polymerization of branched actin networks generates protrusive forces¹⁴¹. In 3D, using adhesions or steric support of the matrix, cells apply these protrusive forces onto the ECM, in the form of structures such as invadopodia, filopodia or lamellipodia^{58,77,142,143}. Alternatively, extension of the microtubule-based spindle generates outward protrusive forces during mitosis^{136,144}. Any process resulting in a shape change in confining 3D ECMs must necessarily generate some combination of protrusive and contractile forces.

Similarly, any process involving increased cell volume in confining 3D matrices necessarily requires force generation. Cell volume is a tightly controlled parameter that is crucial for cell survival and function^{145,146}. Cell volume is governed by the combination of osmotic pressure and hydrostatic pressure differentials between the intracellular space and the extracellular space. To increase volume, cells generate




Fig. 2 | Cell–matrix interactions in 3D. Cells in 3D are confined in all directions due to restrictions imposed by the matrix and can form cell–matrix adhesions on all surfaces contacting the extracellular matrix (ECM). Cells exert contractile, protrusive and volumetric forces on the matrix, generating dilational and distortional stresses in the ECM, which in turn regulate various cell behaviours (Table 1). Hydrostatic stress is volumetric or dilational stress that acts to increase or decrease the volume of an object on which it acts, without changing its shape. Deviatoric stress is distortional

stress that acts to change the shape of an object on which it acts, without changing its volume. Hydrostatic and deviatoric stresses combine to produce net 3D stress fields which cells perceive. These stress fields directly deform cells and influence their behaviour, including proliferation, migration and differentiation. In addition to this, such stresses change over time depending on ECM properties such as viscoelasticity, degradability and plasticity, and form a positive feedback loop with the cell-generated forces. RGD, arginine–glycine–aspartate.

osmotic pressure by increasing the concentration of ions inside themselves via the activity of ion pumps and channels^{145,147}. This draws water into cells both by diffusion across the cell membrane and transport via water channels such as aquaporins, thereby causing volume expansion¹⁴⁵. Cell volume expansion can occur both globally and locally.

For example, in 3D confining matrices, nuclear entry into thin protrusions acts as a piston¹⁴⁸ to pressurize protrusions by opening ion channels, which subsequently generates osmotic and hydrostatic pressure to expand the protrusion and expand the ECM pore to create a track allowing cell migration⁷⁸. Water flux, however, does not necessarily

indicate volume changes as directed water flow across the cell can drive cell migration¹⁴⁹. Overall, cells generate localized contractile and protrusive forces on ECM, as well as global outward forces during cell volume expansion, in 3D.

ECM stresses in 3D

Cellular forces on ECMs in 3D result in complex mechanical stress fields, which in turn act upon other cells as well as triggering feedback mechanisms in cells applying these forces. These force fields in the matrix can be interpreted in the form of a combination of hydrostatic and deviatoric components. Hydrostatic stresses are dilational in nature or act to change ECM volume, or from the cellular perspective, oppose or promote cell volume changes. For example, as tumour cells proliferate in spheroids in 3D, hydrostatic stresses are generated which mechanically oppose tumour growth^{150,151}. Deviatoric stresses, on the other hand, are distortional in nature and act to change morphology while preserving volume. Such distortional stresses are necessary for matrix remodelling and fibre alignment, which in turn promote cell spreading and migration^{19,24}. The extents of cell deformation and morphology change due to these stresses are dependent on cell mechanical properties. Cells actively regulate their cytoskeletal and nucleoskeletal proteins as well as fixed charges (the net electric charge of all intercellular components that cannot freely diffuse out of the cell) and the concentration of macromolecules, determining the viscoelasticity, poroelasticity and non-linearly elasticity of the cell^{152,153}. Such emergent mechanical properties of a cell result in a net bulk modulus which determines to what extent the cell is able to resist a change in volume and a shear modulus which determines the cell's resistance to distortion. The cell bulk modulus is on the order of megapascals to gigapascals, whereas the shear modulus is on the order of kilopascals¹⁵⁴. Thus, volume changes in cells must be regulated actively, since the bulk modulus is so much higher than typical physiological stresses in soft tissues resulting from cell-generated or externally applied forces. These moduli determine a cell's ability to change volume and navigate confining environments. For example, nuclear stiffness governs cell migration through confining spaces^{74,155–157}. Overall, cell mechanical properties in conjunction with matrix stresses dictate cell morphology and behaviours such as migration and differentiation in 3D.

Cell–ECM mechanical feedback

As cells interact with physiological ECMs in 3D, the interactions are dynamic as matrix properties change over time due to matrix viscoelasticity (relaxation and creep), plasticity, degradation and deposition. Natural ECMs dissipate forces and flow over time due to viscoelasticity and degradability, and undergo permanent deformation due to plasticity. Further, these interactions depend on force or deformation scales (or magnitudes) due to nonlinear elasticity of the ECM, whereby matrix resistance increases with increased magnitude of force or deformation, thereby supporting the generation of higher cellular forces and forming a positive feedback loop. Thus, the timescales and magnitudes of cellular forces exerted on the 3D microenvironment are critical. For example, actomyosin contractile forces applied on ECM fibres generate distortional stress and locally align fibres¹⁵⁸. In nonlinear elastic ECMs such as collagen, this fibre alignment increases local stiffness of the matrix, which in turn promotes higher force generation and increases cell stiffness, revealing a positive mechanical feedback loop between cells and ECM¹⁵⁹. Interestingly, fibroblasts exploit nonlinear elasticity of the ECM and mechanical feedback loops to migrate by generating fibre alignment and higher forces at the front of a migrating cell than

at the rear¹⁶⁰. By contrast, in linear elastic ECMs such feedback loops are absent, which prevents higher force generation and the formation of lamellipodia^{57,161}. Similar feedback loops are observed between cellular pushing forces and matrix viscoelasticity or plasticity^{62,77,162,163}. In confining nanoporous ECMs, cancer cells apply protrusive forces to deform the ECM, and in sufficiently plastic ECMs such forces lead to permanent matrix deformations, which in turn promote growth of protrusions and result in larger pores for cell migration. In addition, deposition of matrix by cells, for example MSCs secreting matrix proteins such as fibronectin, laminin and collagen, leads to the formation of an endogenous ECM that the cell interacts with, and can mediate mechanotransduction^{82,164}. Thus, dynamic cell–ECM interactions and positive cell–ECM feedback loops orchestrate cell behaviours in 3D.

Mechanisms of 3D mechanotransduction


In this section, we discuss mechanisms of 3D mechanotransduction mediated through two major classes of membrane proteins, integrins and mechanosensitive ion channels, and how these two pathways converge on the nucleus (Fig. 3). Many of these 3D studies were performed in hydrogels with independently tunable stiffness, stress relaxation and degradability (see Box 1).

Integrin-mediated mechanotransduction

Similarly to their role in 2D (Box 2), integrins have been identified as central regulators of mechanotransduction in 3D, often through integrin clustering. For example, increasing the stiffness of col-I-rich gels used to culture mammary epithelial cells in 3D from hundreds of pascals to kilopascals (as is observed during breast cancer progression) – through either increased col-I density or crosslinking – promotes a malignant phenotype characterized by increased proliferation and invasion into the surrounding matrix through $\alpha 5$ and $\beta 1$ integrins and integrin clustering^{119,120}. Integrin binding to stiff ECM in dense col-I gels leads to activation of FAK, activated Rho signalling and increased cell contractility, causing integrin clustering^{119,120,165}. These events lead to downstream activation of the Ras–mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) and phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (PI3K) pathways, both activated during breast cancer progression, which promote the growth of a tumour and invasion¹⁶⁵. Interestingly, an opposite trend was observed when mammary epithelial cells were cultured in interpenetrating networks of rBM and alginate, used to mimic pre-invasive breast cancer where cells are surrounded by BM; in this scenario, increased stiffness inhibited the formation of clustered $\alpha 6 \beta 4$ integrin-containing adhesions, thereby promoting an invasive phenotype through activation of RAC1 and PI3K¹²². Together these data indicate that stiffness- and ligand-mediated clustering of multiple integrin types plays a critical role in 3D mechanotransduction in cancer cells and cancer progression.

Integrin-mediated mechanotransduction also plays a central role in how stiffness, degradability, stress relaxation and stress stiffening regulate differentiation of stem cells. MSCs encapsulated in ionically crosslinked RGD-coupled viscoelastic alginate hydrogels with an elastic modulus in the range of 11–30 kPa differentiated into osteoblasts, in an integrin-mediated manner, whereas those cultured in lower-stiffness gels underwent adipogenesis. The differentiation state was associated with integrin clustering, with maximum levels of integrin clustering associated with optimal osteogenic differentiation. Integrin clustering was driven by contractility-mediated forces. Interestingly, in covalently crosslinked non-degradable HA hydrogels, hydrogel stiffness did not impact differentiation, with adipogenesis observed from 1 kPa to 100 kPa. Instead, degradability of the HA hydrogels was required

a 2D mechanotransduction



b 3D mechanotransduction




Fig. 3 | 2D and 3D mechanotransduction. a, Cells sense substrate stiffness by exerting contractile forces on 2D substrates with stress fibres through focal adhesions, which activates various proteins, such as focal adhesion kinase (FAK), talin, Rho and ROCK, at the adhesion site. Activation of these proteins leads to adhesion maturation and stress fibre formation and contractility, which in turn transmits forces to the nucleus via the linker of nucleoskeleton and cytoskeleton (LINC) complex, resulting in changes in nuclear envelope tension and nuclear pore opening. This allows the nuclear entry of proteins such as the transcription regulator YAP, leading to a downstream impact on cell phenotype. Moreover, in 2D, a cell can spread laterally without encountering any mechanical confinement. **b,** Cells embedded in the extracellular matrix (ECM) sense stiffness and viscoelastic properties of the matrix through integrin binding, activation

and clustering, while sensing confinement, viscoelasticity and plasticity through cell volume changes and ion channel activation, which leads to Ca^{2+} ion influx. Additionally, ECM stiffness/viscoelasticity and confinement regulate activation of various proteins, such as FAK, ROCK, MLCK, pathways such as those involving phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (PI3K), ERK and Rho, and transcription regulators such as YAP, p27, Sp1, RUNX2 and EGR1. However, clear mechanistic links between the ECM properties and activation of these proteins, pathways and transcription regulators remain unclear. Unknown connections in the pathways are indicated by question marks. Both mechanisms of mechanotransduction converge on the nucleus and regulate the activation of transcription factors (TFs), which are facilitated by chromatin remodelling and control cell behaviour.

Box 2

Mechanotransduction: lessons from 2D

Many studies of mechanotransduction in 2D have converged upon a central mechanism by which cells sense stiffness (Fig. 3a). The predominant 2D culture mechanotransduction platform has been cells cultured on type I collagen-coated or fibronectin-coated elastic polyacrylamide substrates with independently tunable stiffness^{59,90}. Cells first bind to the substrate through β 1-containing integrins, initiating the formation of an adhesion complex, and activating actomyosin contractility, focal adhesion kinase (FAK) and the Rho pathway¹¹⁹. As a cell first spreads on the substrate through actin polymerization, or during processes involving actin polymerization such as filopodial extension or lamellipodial protrusion, a molecular clutch mechanism responds to stiffness²⁷⁵. In this mechanism, changes in stiffness mediate engagement of the molecular clutch, involving talin²⁷⁶, that connects polymerizing actin filaments to integrin-based adhesions, governing whether there is productive extension of the cell membrane versus retrograde flow of actin. Over time, nascent adhesions can mature into focal adhesions²⁷⁷, containing talin, vinculin and FAK, which connect to clustered integrin-binding ligands³⁸ extracellularly and highly contractile actin stress fibres intracellularly²⁷⁸. Stress fibres connect to the lamin-containing nucleus through the linker of nucleoskeleton and cytoskeleton (LINC) complex, with higher contractile forces typically observed on stiffer substrates¹¹⁹. Tension across mechanosensitive proteins such as talin²⁷⁹, vinculin²⁸⁰ and lamin² impacts their activation and binding interactions, thereby converting changes in stiffness to biological signalling. Further, tension from stress fibres causes deformation and stretching of the nucleus, which opens up pores in the nucleus, allowing translocation of the transcription regulator YAP into the nucleus, and subsequent

activation of transcriptional pathways, regulating processes such as proliferation and differentiation^{281–283}.

Various other mechanisms and relations have been described in 2D. There is a strong correlation between cell spreading area and extracellular matrix (ECM) stiffness, and limiting cell spreading area on substrates with high stiffness can lead to mechanotransduction behaviours observed on soft substrates^{234,242,281}. Cell adhesion ligand density, the spacing of the ligands and the architecture of ECM ligands can play a key role in mediating mechanotransduction^{63,240,284}. Viscoelastic and viscoplastic substrates are amenable to ligand clustering and a longer timescale of molecular clutch binding, leading to spreading, migration and differentiation behaviours similarly to what is observed on stiffer elastic substrates^{96,238,248}. By contrast, viscoelastic substrates that are not viscoplastic can lead to the opposite trend^{95,285}. In one study, increased stiffness reduced cell volume, and modulating cell volume directly controlled mechanotransduction outcomes¹⁵⁴. In addition to YAP, MRTF-A, which responds to actin polymerization, has been implicated in mediating stiffness sensing at the transcriptional level^{286,287}. Further, stress fibres also affect chromatin accessibility through their contractility via redistribution of histone deacetylase 3 to the nucleus²⁸⁸. Finally, recent studies have found distinct mechanotransduction behaviours in epithelial monolayers, finding, for example, that monolayers can sense shallow stiffness gradients more robustly than single cells during durotaxis⁷¹, suggesting the role of collective cell behaviour in mediating 2D cell–ECM mechanotransduction. Many excellent reviews cover 2D mechanotransduction in more detail (see, for example, refs. 4,5,8).

for osteogenesis, with MSCs able to exert larger integrin-mediated tractions with increasing degradability⁶⁰. Further, in another study, increased rate of stress relaxation in RGD-coupled alginate hydrogels with a modulus of 20 kPa promoted increased osteogenic differentiation of MSCs, and differentiation was associated with integrin clustering⁴⁰. Importantly, cell morphology was decoupled from osteogenic differentiation in all of these studies, in contrast to the result in 2D, where 2D morphologies are distinct for adipogenic and osteogenic differentiation⁵⁶. Finally, stress stiffening in 0.2–0.4-kPa polyisocyanate hydrogels also led to integrin clustering in MSCs and a shift of differentiation from adipogenesis to osteogenesis¹⁰⁰. The findings of these studies are consistent with the concept that matrix remodeling, facilitated by either viscoelasticity or degradability, and tension across the integrins, mediated by the stiffness and nonlinear elasticity, are required for osteogenesis. In vasculogenesis of endothelial progenitor cells, ECM viscoelasticity along with a hypoxic environment promotes the aggregation of endothelial progenitor cells through contractility-mediated integrin clustering^{114,166}.

Although there are similarities between 2D and 3D integrin-mediated mechanotransduction pathways, key differences have been implicated in actin organization and cell-shape mediated differentiation. This is suggested by the differences in adhesion structures and the actin cytoskeleton, with cells not exhibiting focal adhesions or stress fibres

in most 3D conditions, as described in the previous section. Indeed, cell morphology was decoupled from osteogenic differentiation of MSCs in 3D^{39,40,60}, in contrast to the result in 2D⁵⁶, and some studies have even demonstrated integrin-mediated osteogenic differentiation in 3D is independent of contractility^{100,167}. However, in contrast to the well-known pathways and events following integrin–ECM binding in 2D culture, there is limited available information on downstream molecular events following integrin engagement in 3D. Further, the application of the molecular clutch mechanism, broadly implicated in 2D mechanotransduction (Box 2), to 3D contexts remains to be tested. These observations highlight the gaps in our understanding of integrin-mediated mechanotransduction in 3D.

Confinement sensing by cell volume regulation

Recent work has pointed towards the role of active regulation of cell volume and activation of mechanosensitive ion channels in 3D mechanotransduction, particularly in the context of sensing mechanical confinement. For example, chondrocytes increase their overall volume with increased stress relaxation of alginate hydrogels without integrin-binding ligands, and increased cell volume promoted increased cartilage matrix deposition and the chondrogenic phenotype⁸⁴. Similarly, cell volume has been shown to regulate various intracellular events, such as actin organization, nuclear accumulation of histones, YAP and TAZ

localization, nuclear shape and focal adhesions for MSCs cultured in 3D polydimethylsiloxane microwells¹⁶⁸. Cell volume expansion is possible in degradable hydrogels or hydrogels with fast stress relaxation, but is necessarily restricted in more confining elastic hydrogels. Hence, cell volume regulation has been recognized as an important mediator of 3D mechanotransduction.

Mechanosensitive ion channels, particularly TRPV4 channels, have emerged as key sensors of changes in cell volume. In MSCs cultured in RGD-coupled alginate hydrogels of different timescales of stress relaxation with the same initial stiffness, faster stress relaxation leads to increased cell volumes associated with activation of TRPV4 ion channels⁶¹. Increased calcium influx through TRPV4 activation drives nuclear localization of RUNX2, a transcription factor involved in osteogenic differentiation. Similarly, in the context of cancer cell proliferation in confining alginate hydrogels, cell growth during the G1 phase of the cell cycle activated a TRPV4–PI3K–AKT–p27 signalling axis that drove S phase progression and proliferation¹⁰⁶. However, increased confinement in more elastic gels blocked cell growth and activation of this pathway. Further, TRPV4 was linked to cell volume expansion and mechanical confinement sensing in chondrocytes, and controlled phosphorylation of glycogen synthase kinase 3 β (GSK3 β), an enzyme associated with osteoarthritis¹⁶⁹. In myofibroblast activation, increased stiffness induces TRPV4 activation and YAP nuclear localization, suggesting a regulatory role of TRPV4 in mediating YAP nuclear shuttling and signalling¹⁷⁰. Membrane tension connects cell volume to activation of mechanosensitive ion channels¹⁷¹. PIEZO1, a mechanosensitive ion channel central to force sensing in many contexts¹⁷², has also been implicated in some studies^{106,171}, but its role in responses to ECM-mediated confinement remains less clear. Together these studies indicate that confinement regulates cell volume expansion, and as cell volume increases, membrane tension increases, activating mechanosensitive ion channels, allowing the passage of ions across the membrane, which in turn activate various signalling pathways to drive mechanotransduction.

Several key questions remain regarding this mode of mechanotransduction. For example, it is unclear what initiates cell volume expansion in many of the aforementioned studies. Moreover, it has been observed that integrins are also implicated in mechanotransduction in parallel with mechanosensitive ion channel-mediated mechanotransduction. For example, during MSC differentiation^{40,60}, cells use integrin binding and clustering in addition to TRPV4-mediated volume expansion to regulate their differentiation pathways, suggesting the possibility of interactions or crosstalk between integrin-mediated pathways and ion channel-mediated pathways. In another connection, the findings regarding the role of mechanosensitive ion channels in cell–ECM mechanotransduction complement findings regarding the role of these channels in force-mediated mechanotransduction, including application of stretch and shear, indicating the potential for crosstalk between these distinct modes of mechanotransduction^{173,174}.

Nuclear mechanotransduction

As the centre of transcription, the nucleus is a key element of mechanotransduction pathways downstream of the integrin-mediated and the mechanosensitive ion channel-mediated routes. The membrane of the nucleus is mechanically linked to the actin cytoskeleton through linker of nucleoskeleton and cytoskeleton (LINC) complexes comprising nesprins and SUN (also known as Sad1 in yeast and UNC-84 in *Caenorhabditis elegans*). Forces from actomyosin-based contractility, which acts extracellularly on ECM in both 2D and 3D environments,

can also be transmitted to the nucleus through LINC complexes, leading to mechanical deformations of the nucleus¹⁷⁵. However, a clear mechanism associating cellular forces with nuclear deformation in 3D is still unclear, in part due to lack of clarity over the actin cytoskeletal structure for cells in 3D. In the following subsections, we discuss key nuclear changes observed in cells cultured in 3D and linked to mechanotransduction.

Nuclear morphologies. 2D studies have demonstrated a change of nuclear morphology is a clear indicator of mechanotransduction associated with various outcomes, such as epigenetic remodelling, shuttling of transcription factors such as YAP and TAZ and cell fate changes¹⁷⁵. However, nuclear morphologies in 3D differ significantly from those observed in 2D cell culture models. For example, projected nuclear areas and circularity are similar for mammary epithelial cells and pluripotent stem cells in vivo and in 3D culture models^{41,126} but are significantly greater in 2D¹⁵⁴. Further, both increased stiffness and increased degradability lead to increased nuclear wrinkling in 3D^{127,176}, whereas increased stiffness has the opposite effect on nuclear wrinkling in 2D¹⁷⁶. Mechanosensitive ion channels in the nucleus, recently implicated in cell migration in confining microenvironments^{155,156}, could potentially play a role in responding to morphological changes in the nucleus in 3D. Together these findings indicate that nuclear mechanotransduction mechanisms in 3D are likely different from those in 2D.

Regulation of transcription factors. RNA sequencing studies show that changes in hydrogel stiffness, stress relaxation, and ligand type and density are each associated with large changes in gene expression in different cell types^{126,177}. Whereas the co-regulators YAP and TAZ have been described as universal mechanotransducers in 2D culture studies, their role in 3D mechanotransduction is context dependent. Increased stiffness, faster stress relaxation and increased degradability promote increased YAP and TAZ nuclear localization in MSCs in 3D^{40,176}. However, YAP localization was decoupled from osteogenesis induced by stiffness^{40,61}. Further, in a 3D culture model of pre-invasive breast cancer, YAP was not required for mechanotransduction, consistent with in vivo observations¹²⁶. Instead, transcription factors such as STAT3, p300 and Sp1 were implicated^{126,127}. Contrastingly, YAP is found to play a role in 3D mechanotransduction in gastric cancer. Moreover, in 2D, YAP and TAZ localization was observed in the absence of nuclear wrinkling¹⁷⁶, whereas in 3D¹⁷⁸, nuclear wrinkling is correlated with YAP and TAZ localization. In neural stem cell differentiation, stiff ECM is associated with nuclear localization of the transcription factor EGR1 in 3D but not in 2D, and this occurs in the absence of integrin-based adhesions¹⁷⁹. In MSCs, soft ECM increases the clustering of the inflammatory receptor tumour necrosis factor (TNF), which further activates nuclear factor- κ B (NF- κ B) and expression of chemokines and cytokines that promote monocyte recruitment and differentiation¹⁸⁰. This set of studies highlights the role of transcription factors in mediating mechanotransduction in 3D. However, how these different transcription factors are regulated by mechanical properties of the ECM remains a key open question.

Epigenetic regulation of chromatin accessibility. Several recent studies have pointed to a key role of chromatin accessibility in mediating mechanotransduction. In the 3D culture model of pre-invasive breast cancer, increased ECM stiffness induced broad changes in chromatin accessibility mediated by histone deacetylases 3 and 8, with chromatin becoming much more open¹²⁷. Increased chromatin accessibility then allowed binding of the transcription factor Sp1, which led

to downstream changes in gene expression that functionally mediated the malignant phenotype. In a gastric cancer study, increased ECM stiffness led to YAP translocation into the nucleus in coordination with DNA demethylation and increased chromatin accessibility of the YAP promoter region, together inducing the tumorigenic phenotype¹⁷⁸. Interestingly, this is in contrast to recent 2D studies where chromatin accessibility in fibroblasts decreased with increased stiffness, which led to compaction of chromatin promoting persistent activation of fibroblasts¹⁸¹. In addition to stiffness, matrix degradability affected chromatin organization in neural progenitor cells, where chromatin accessibility was increased with enhanced degradability¹⁸². Thus, chromatin accessibility has emerged as a key regulator of 3D mechanotransduction, although how this is regulated and functions in different contexts and why effects may be different from those in 2D studies remain to be determined.

Mechanotransduction in tissues

In this section, we describe some selected examples of how cell–ECM mechanotransduction is thought to play a role in tissue physiology (Figs. 4,5), highlighting the ubiquity and importance of 3D mechanotransduction *in vivo*.

Development

Cell–ECM interactions and mechanotransduction are implicated in multiple stages of development^{183,184}. During peri-implantation development, BM secretion enables apicobasal polarization and formation of the epiblast cavity¹⁸⁵. During gastrulation, localized degradation of the BM mediates migration of primitive streak cells, establishing the body axes in mice¹⁸⁶ (Fig. 4), whereas differences in cell stiffness drive the flow of cells and internalization of the gastrulating furrow¹⁸⁷. Fluidization and rigidity transition of tissues – whereby tissues switch from being solid-like to being fluid-like and vice versa – are recurring themes for processes that shape tissues during development and have recently been linked to changes in ECM-dependent confinement^{188–190}. Further, migrating neural crest cells generate a stiffness gradient via N-cadherin-mediated cell–cell interactions that they then follow using

durotaxis¹⁹¹. At later stages of development, compaction of col-I-rich ECM by cell intercalation and contractility enables budding and branching of epithelia in salivary glands¹⁹² and in mesenchymal condensates (densified mesenchymal structures that deform during epithelial morphogenesis)¹⁹³.

Homeostasis and regeneration

In adults, mechanotransduction-regulated behaviours maintain homeostasis and normal activity. Fibroblasts in stromal tissues maintain or modulate a state of tensional force by contracting against their surrounding col-I-rich stromal ECM to maintain mechanical homeostasis, a state of mechanical equilibrium^{194,195}. Differentiation or maintenance of stemness in stem cells, or maintenance of normal phenotypes in differentiated cells, is often supported by stiffness, and in some cases viscoelasticity, of the niche^{56,84,88,92}. When mechanisms maintaining normal tissue function become disrupted, diseases such as fibrosis and cancer, both discussed in the following subsections, can occur¹⁹⁶, as can diseases such as osteoarthritis¹⁶⁹, polycystic kidney disease¹⁹⁷ and aneurysms¹⁹⁸.

Mechanotransduction is also implicated in regenerative processes. For example, the haematoma that follows a bone fracture is highly viscoelastic, and such viscoelasticity has been found to be necessary for infiltration of MSCs and for promoting osteogenesis of the MSCs *in vivo*^{40,78,199} (Fig. 5b).

Ageing and fibrosis

Ageing disrupts tissue properties and alters homeostatic mechanosensation, further reinforcing disease phenotypes²⁰⁰. Skin BM exhibits characteristic thinning with increasing age²⁰⁰, whereas BMs in the retina and blood–brain barrier thicken²⁰¹. In stromal matrices that fill up soft tissues and are rich in col-I, build-up of advanced glycation end products and increased non-enzymatic crosslinking of col-I results in pockets of stiff matrix, whereas matrix metalloproteinase-driven matrix degradation softens other regions of the stroma, resulting in highly heterogeneous collagen networks with low solubility²⁰⁰, resulting in fibroblast senescence²⁰² and reduced motility²⁰³. These changes




Fig. 4 | Mechanotransduction in development. During development, basement membrane secretion and basement membrane degradation trigger mouse epiblast lumenogenesis and gastrulation, respectively. After implantation, trophoblast cells in the mouse embryo secrete a basement membrane around

the epiblast, which triggers polarization and lumen formation in the epiblast. Later during gastrulation, gastrulating cells, also called 'primitive streak cells', secrete proteases to locally degrade the basement membrane layer and enable migration.




Fig. 5 | Mechanotransduction in tissues. **a**, In homeostasis, healthy extracellular matrix (ECM) and fibroblasts help maintain normally functioning epithelium by maintaining optimal ECM mechanical properties such as stiffness and viscoelasticity. **b**, Following a bone fracture, viscoelasticity of the fracture haematoma promotes infiltration of mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) and the stiff bone surface promotes differentiation of MSCs into bone-producing osteoblasts. **c**, Myofibroblast differentiation and heterogeneous ECM occurring during ageing result in loss of epithelial integrity and function. As tissue fibrosis proceeds with ageing, normal fibroblasts differentiate into a myofibroblast phenotype and heterogeneously secrete and deform the ECM. Such a heterogeneous

matrix promotes further myofibroblast differentiation and results in altered ECM mechanical properties. Epithelial cells sense these altered ECM properties and undergo transcriptional changes causing loss of epithelial integrity and function. **d**, During cancer progression, cancer-associated fibroblasts remodel the ECM into a dense, stiff matrix. This increase in ECM stiffness, in combination with other cues and genetic changes in the cancer cells, leads to activation of a malignant phenotype in epithelial cells. These cells then undergo sustained proliferation, breach the basement membrane during invasion, migrate into the stromal matrix and eventually can metastasize.

Glossary

Advanced glycation end products

Proteins or lipids that are glycosylated when exposed to sugars, and are a biomarker implicated in many diseases, such as diabetes and atherosclerosis.

Aggrecan

The major proteoglycan in the articular cartilage which provides hydration to the cartilage.

Arginine–glycine–aspartate (RGD) sequences

A three-peptide cell–matrix adhesion motif derived from extracellular matrix proteins such as fibronectin and vitronectin that serves as a binding site for integrins such as $\alpha v\beta 3$, $\alpha 5\beta 1$ and $\alpha IIb\beta 3$.

Assay for transposase-accessible chromatin using sequencing

(ATAC-seq). A genome wide assay that identifies accessible DNA regions/ genome-wide chromatin accessibility.

Creep

A behaviour of viscoelastic materials, the time-dependent deformation or strain of a material under constant force/stress.

Deviatoric stresses

Distortional mechanical stresses that act to change the shape of an object on which they act, without changing its volume.

Fibrillar adhesions

Cell–extracellular matrix adhesions whose shapes are elliptical, often forming along fibrous extracellular matrix.

Filipodia

Actin-rich protrusions that are long and thin, and can be highly dynamic.

Fluorescence resonance energy transfer

Energy transfer between two light-sensitive molecules. The efficiency of this energy transfer is inversely proportional to the sixth power of the distance between the molecules.

This can be used to study small changes in distances between molecules.

Focal adhesion kinase

(FAK). A receptor tyrosine kinase protein that localizes to focal complexes at cell–extracellular matrix adhesion sites and plays a crucial role in the several integrin-dependent mechanotransductive pathways.

Focal adhesions

Large cell–matrix adhesions typically formed by cells cultured on stiff 2D substrates, characterized by clustered integrin receptors, localization of proteins such as paxillin, talin, vinculin, and phosphorylated focal adhesion kinase (FAK) and thick actomyosin stress fibres, mediating strong cell–substrate adhesion.

Hydrostatic stresses

Volumetric or dilational stresses that act to increase or decrease the volume of an object on which they act, without changing its shape.

Invadopodia

Actin-rich structures that are present at the basal surface of cells, and that are thought to degrade and apply forces to extracellular matrix.

Lamellipodia

Thin sheet-like protrusions composed of a branched network of actin filaments. Extension of lamellipodia at the leading edge is often implicated in driving cell migration.

Lysyl oxidase

An enzyme that converts lysine molecules into highly reactive aldehydes that form crosslinks in extracellular matrix proteins such as type I collagen and elastin.

Matrix metalloproteinases

Cell-secreted enzymes that are capable of proteolytically degrading various extracellular matrix components.

Mechanical plasticity

A material property that defines the extent to which the material undergoes permanent or irreversible deformation following the application and release of external deformation or loading.

Mechanosensitive ion channels

Ion channels that open or close in response to cell membrane stretch or tension. TRPV4 and PIEZO1 are examples of mechanosensitive ion channels implicated in mechanotransduction.

Mesenchymal stem cells

(MSCs). Multipotent stem cells that are found in the bone marrow, which have been reported to differentiate into osteoblasts, adipocytes, chondrocytes, myocytes and neurons.

Microtentacles

Microtubule-based membrane protrusions which are often observed in detached circulating tumour cells.

MRTF-A

Myocardin-related transcription factor A, a transcription factor that plays a key role in mediating smooth muscle cell differentiation.

Nonlinear elasticity

Elasticity is the ability of a material to retain its initial shape/configuration following the application and release of external deformation or loading. Nonlinear elasticity is defined as the nonlinear relation between stress and strain for a material, in contrast to linear elasticity, which is defined as the linear relation between stress and strain of a material until the material starts to yield.

Poroelasticity

A material property that describes the interaction between fluid flow and solid deformations within a porous material. Cells and extracellular matrices are usually poroelastic.

Proteoglycans

Supramolecules that possess protein as a core and a side chain of sugars.

Reconstituted BM (rBM) matrices

Commercially available matrices such as Matrigel or Geltrex that are derived from Engelbreth–Holm–Swarm tumour, a mouse sarcoma, and that are commonly used for in vitro cell culture and contain laminin, type IV collagen, entactin, perlecan and other components.

RHAMM

Receptor for hyaluronan-mediated motility, a protein which binds to hyaluronan.

Rho signalling

A cell signalling pathway involved in regulation of a wide variety of cell processes, such as cell spreading, survival, proliferation and adhesion.

Stiffness

The resistance to deformation of a specific structure, which is dependent on the Young's modulus and geometry of the structure. Hence, stiffness is regarded as a property of a specific structure, whereas Young's modulus is an inherent property of the material.

Strain

A measure of localized deformation in a material, with uniaxial strain typically defined as the ratio of deformation to the original length of the material.

Stress

A measure of force per unit area, which has the unit of pascals.

Stress relaxation

A behaviour of viscoelastic materials referring to the time-dependent change in stress in a material under constant deformation.

Tenascin C

A multimodular extracellular matrix glycoprotein which is expressed in various tissues during development, disease or injury.

Glossary (continued)

Traction force microscopy

A technique that experimentally measures the force-induced displacement field of a substrate with known mechanical properties and uses this to computationally determine the cell–extracellular matrix forces applied to the substrate.

Versican

A large extracellular matrix proteoglycan that is found in various tissues, such as blood vessels and skin.

Viscoelasticity

A property of materials that exhibit some behaviours characteristic of

elastic solids and some of viscous liquids, and is characterized by a time-dependent mechanical response (that is, creep or stress relaxation).

YAP and TAZ

Transcription co-activators that shuttle between the nucleus and the

cytoplasm and play an important role in mediating mechanotransduction, particularly in 2D. When translocated to the nucleus, YAP and TAZ do not directly bind to DNA but regulate gene expression through their binding to transcription factors of the TEAD family.

alter epithelial and mesenchymal cell phenotypes, and result in positive feedback between changes in cell phenotype and ECM structure which increase the risk of diseases such as fibrosis and cancer^{200,204,205}.

Tissue fibrosis involving excessive deposition of ECM and aberrant tissue mechanics is implicated in many deaths²⁰⁶. Persistent activation of fibroblasts to a myofibroblast phenotype is responsible for poor prognosis of fibrotic diseases, and is driven by altered mechanosensing¹⁸¹. As opposed to regenerative wound healing, fibrosis leads to scar formation, wherein excess secretion⁵⁷ and alteration of collagen architecture²⁰⁷ leads to differentiation of fibroblasts to myofibroblasts, which in turn reinforce the fibrotic niche²⁰⁸ (Fig. 5c). Fibrosis of the bone marrow, or myelofibrosis, increases marrow stiffness and reduces stress relaxation, promoting monocyte differentiation towards dendritic cells, thus promoting a pro-inflammatory microenvironment and disease progression¹⁰⁴.

Cancer

Although at the root of cancer are mutations that activate oncogenes and inactivate tumour suppressor genes, as well as changes in gene copy number resulting from genomic instability, there has been increased recognition that the tumour microenvironment, including ECM mechanics, plays a key role in restraining or promoting tumour progression^{101,209}. In breast cancer, increased mammographic density, associated with increased ECM stiffness, is a well-known risk factor for disease progression^{210,211}. Increased ECM stiffness is associated with increased col-I density and increased crosslinking of col-I, and likely results from the activity of cancer-associated fibroblasts and tumour-associated macrophages^{212,213}. Increased ECM stiffness promotes a more proliferative and invasive phenotype in breast cancer^{118–122,126} (Fig. 5d). Matrix mechanical plasticity and degradation of the stromal matrix mediate the formation of collagen tracks that carcinoma cells use to migrate away from the tumour^{73,77,214}. Similarly, increased stiffness and more fibrillar col-I has been linked to other cancers including pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma^{215,216}, glioma brain cancer⁴⁶, colorectal cancer²¹⁷, lung cancer²¹⁸, hepatocellular carcinoma²¹⁹ and cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma²²⁰. Changes in viscoelasticity are also associated with breast cancer progression²²¹, brain cancer²²² and liver cancer²²³, and likely other cancers, and also regulate tumour spheroid growth in vitro¹⁰⁶; however, the functional significance of these changes in viscoelasticity for disease progression in vivo are unclear.

Conclusions and perspectives

Mechanotransduction of cells in 3D impacts various cellular behaviours which play a key role in many aspects of tissue physiology, from development to disease. 2D culture models are sufficient for capturing critical aspects of mechanotransduction in vivo in some contexts; in other contexts, 3D culture is required. In 3D culture, it has become

clear that stiffness, viscoelasticity, plasticity and degradability are key parameters regulating cell behaviours (Table 1). Confinement has emerged as a key aspect of the mechanical microenvironment in 3D. Mechanosensitive ion channel-mediated sensing of confinement can, at least in some cases, complement integrin-mediated mechanotransduction pathways to regulate nuclear morphologies, chromatin accessibility and transcription factor activity, which in turn regulate gene expression and cell phenotype.

Despite these major insights, key gaps in our knowledge of cell–ECM mechanotransduction in 3D remain, as we have highlighted throughout this Review. Beyond integrins and mechanosensitive ion channels, it remains relatively unclear how mechanical cues are transduced in the 3D context. Specifically, subcellular cytoskeletal structures, downstream mechanotransduction molecules, the specific pathways, chromatin remodelling enzymes, and events and sets of transcription factors that mediate mechanotransduction remain to be uncovered. Promisingly, a large set of tools is emerging that can potentially be applied to 3D culture. Spatiotemporal control of local hydrogel properties²²⁴ and single-cell microencapsulations²²⁵ provide more tailored control of local cell microenvironments in 3D. Super-resolution imaging techniques²²⁶ suitable for 3D can reveal the structure of integrin-based adhesions, the actin cytoskeleton and the actomyosin machinery of cells in 3D, as well as actin adaptor proteins such as talin and vinculin, and the spatiotemporal dynamics of Rho GTPase activation as indicated by fluorescence resonance energy transfer-based sensors²²⁷. Further, genome-wide assays such as RNA sequencing and single-cell RNA sequencing for gene expression or assay for transposase-accessible chromatin using sequencing (ATAC-seq) for chromatin accessibility and genome-wide CRISPR screens tailored for 3D assays²²⁸ can identify mechanotransduction regulators unique to 3D.

In addition to the need for deeper mechanistic insights, there is also a critical requirement for studies on in vivo relevance. This has been done in a number of contexts often by associating measured tissue mechanics with biological signatures (that is, gene expression or transcription factor activation) predicted from 3D culture studies, or by perturbing key mechanotransduction regulators in vivo, such as FAK or YAP, and examining the downstream effect. Clever approaches to directly modulate stiffness and viscoelasticity in vivo, or perturb novel downstream regulators, could further increase confidence in the relevance of the causal, mechanistic insights reported in in vitro studies. Furthermore, although the roles of mechanotransduction pathways in development and cancer have been studied greatly and are becoming increasingly clear, the roles of mechanotransduction behaviours in other contexts, including homeostasis, regenerative processes, ageing, various other diseases and immune cell activity, require significant additional effort.

These future efforts regrading mechanotransduction are likely to be very impactful. Beyond providing a fundamental understanding of cell and tissue physiology, these studies can advance the rapidly emerging area of mechanotherapy, which holds great promise for medicine. In a recent mouse study²²⁹, fibrosis induced by stiff (on the order of megapascals) silicone implants, which are used in breast mastectomy, was reduced by encapsulating the stiff implants in soft (on the order of kilopascals) silicone implants. Relatedly, another study²³⁰ had the objective to reduce fibrosis associated with skin grafting. By the targeting of mechanotransduction using a small-molecule FAK inhibitor, the fibrotic nature of the skin was substantially reduced, with increased healing of wounds. In the context of ovarian fibrosis, targeting fibrotic col-1 using antifibrosis drugs restored ovulation in mice²³¹.

ECM stiffness and degradability have been the clinical targets in the context of cancer²³²; however, results have been mixed. In the context of stiffness, inhibition of lysyl oxidases (NCT00195091), β 1 integrin-mediated mechanotransduction (NCT02683824) and FAK (NCT03727880) are undergoing clinical trials. In the context of ECM degradation, matrix metalloproteinase inhibition was not effective in preventing cancer progression, potentially owing to off-target effects as well as alternative mechanisms of invasion of cancer cells, not relying on ECM proteolysis. Matrix metalloproteinase inhibition also has severe side effects²³². Future efforts could potentially target other downstream effectors of mechanotransduction as well as viscoelasticity and viscoplasticity in combination with degradation.

Injecting cells within biomaterial carriers into injured or diseased tissues is a common approach in regenerative medicine²³³. Varying stiffness, degradability and viscoelasticity has been shown to optimize the in vivo healing response. For example, promoting viscoelasticity of ECM in vivo was shown to increase bone formation by MSCs¹⁹⁹. Interestingly, most biomaterials used in translational applications tend to be viscoelastic or degradable⁵². These findings highlight the importance of mechanotransduction in guiding the selection and use of biomaterials in these applications.

Published online: 27 February 2023

References

- Levental, I., Georges, P. C. & Janmey, P. A. Soft biological materials and their impact on cell function. *Soft Matter* **3**, 299–306 (2007).
- Swift, J. et al. Nuclear lamin-A scales with tissue stiffness and enhances matrix-directed differentiation. *Science* **341**, 1240104 (2013).
- Storm, C., Pastore, J. J., Mackintosh, F. C., Lubensky, T. C. & Janmey, P. A. Nonlinear elasticity in biological gels. *Nature* **435**, 191–194 (2005).
- Discher Dennis, E., Janmey, P. & Wang, Y.-L. Tissue cells feel and respond to the stiffness of their substrate. *Science* **310**, 1139–1143 (2005).
- Vogel, V. & Sheetz, M. Local force and geometry sensing regulate cell functions. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **7**, 265–275 (2006).
- Wozniak, M. A. & Chen, C. S. Mechanotransduction in development: a growing role for contractility. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **10**, 34–43 (2009).
- DuFort, C. C., Paszek, M. J. & Weaver, V. M. Balancing forces: architectural control of mechanotransduction. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **12**, 308–319 (2011).
- Kechagia, J. Z., Ivaska, J. & Roca-Cusachs, P. Integrins as biomechanical sensors of the microenvironment. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **20**, 457–473 (2019).
- Cukierman, E., Pankov, R., Stevens, D. R. & Yamada, K. M. Taking cell-matrix adhesions to the third dimension. *Science* **294**, 1708–1712 (2001).
- This article demonstrates the key differences in the structure and composition of cell-ECM adhesions for fibroblasts between 2D culture, 3D culture and tissues.**
- Baker, B. M. & Chen, C. S. Deconstructing the third dimension – how 3D culture microenvironments alter cellular cues. *J. Cell Sci.* **125**, 3015–3024 (2012).
- Von Der Mark, K., Gauss, V., Von Der Mark, H. & Müller, P. Relationship between cell shape and type of collagen synthesised as chondrocytes lose their cartilage phenotype in culture. *Nature* **267**, 531–532 (1977).
- Petersen, O. W., Rønnov-Jessen, L., Howlett, A. R. & Bissell, M. J. Interaction with basement membrane serves to rapidly distinguish growth and differentiation pattern of normal and malignant human breast epithelial cells. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **89**, 9064–9068 (1992).
- Gerecht, S. et al. Hyaluronic acid hydrogel for controlled self-renewal and differentiation of human embryonic stem cells. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **104**, 11298–11303 (2007).
- Fischbach, C. et al. Cancer cell angiogenic capability is regulated by 3D culture and integrin engagement. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **106**, 399–404 (2009).
- Fratzl, P. in *Collagen: Structure and Mechanics* (ed. Fratzl, P.) 1–13 (Springer, 2008).
- Jokinen, J. et al. Integrin-mediated cell adhesion to type I collagen fibrils. *J. Biol. Chem.* **279**, 31956–31963 (2004).
- Humphries, J. D., Byron, A. & Humphries, M. J. Integrin ligands at a glance. *J. Cell Sci.* **119**, 3901–3903 (2006).
- Gautieri, A., Vesentini, S., Redaelli, A. & Buehler, M. J. Hierarchical structure and nanomechanics of collagen microfibrils from the atomistic scale up. *Nano Lett.* **11**, 757–766 (2011).
- Vader, D., Kabla, A., Weitz, D. & Mahadevan, L. Strain-induced alignment in collagen gels. *PLoS ONE* **4**, e5902 (2009).
- Proestaki, M., Ogren, A., Burkel, B. & Notbohm, J. Modulus of fibrous collagen at the length scale of a cell. *Exp. Mech.* **59**, 1323–1334 (2019).
- Hotary, K., Allen, E., Punturieri, A., Yana, I. & Weiss, S. J. Regulation of cell invasion and morphogenesis in a three-dimensional type I collagen matrix by membrane-type matrix metalloproteinases 1, 2, and 3. *J. Cell Biol.* **149**, 1309–1323 (2000).
- Münster, S. et al. Strain history dependence of the nonlinear stress response of fibrin and collagen networks. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 12197–12202 (2013).
- Nam, S., Hu, K. H., Butte, M. J. & Chaudhuri, O. Strain-enhanced stress relaxation impacts nonlinear elasticity in collagen gels. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 5492–5497 (2016).
- Ban, E. et al. Mechanisms of plastic deformation in collagen networks induced by cellular forces. *Biophys. J.* **114**, 450–461 (2018).
- Collet, J.-P., Shuman, H., Ledger, R. E., Lee, S. & Weisel, J. W. The elasticity of an individual fibrin fiber in a clot. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **102**, 9133–9137 (2005).
- Brown, A. E. X., Litvinov, R. I., Discher, D. E., Purohit, P. K. & Weisel, J. W. Multiscale mechanics of fibrin polymer: gel stretching with protein unfolding and loss of water. *Science* **325**, 741–744 (2009).
- Yurchenco, P. D. Basement membranes: cell scaffoldings and signaling platforms. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* **3**, a004911 (2011).
- Chang, J. & Chaudhuri, O. Beyond proteases: basement membrane mechanics and cancer invasion. *J. Cell Biol.* **218**, 2456–2469 (2019).
- Li, H., Zheng, Y., Han, Y. L., Cai, S. & Guo, M. Nonlinear elasticity of biological basement membrane revealed by rapid inflation and deflation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **118**, e202422118 (2021).
- Stowers, R. S. et al. Extracellular matrix stiffening induces a malignant phenotypic transition in breast epithelial cells. *Cell. Mol. Bioeng.* **10**, 114–123 (2017).
- Reuten, R. et al. Basement membrane stiffness determines metastases formation. *Nat. Mater.* **20**, 892–903 (2021).
- Kleinman, H. K. & Martin, G. R. Matrigel: Basement membrane matrix with biological activity. *Semin. Cancer Biol.* **15**, 378–386 (2005).
- Chopra, A. et al. Augmentation of integrin-mediated mechanotransduction by hyaluronic acid. *Biomaterials* **35**, 71–82 (2014).
- Wolf, K. J. et al. A mode of cell adhesion and migration facilitated by CD44-dependent microtentacles. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **117**, 11432–11443 (2020).
- Wolf, K. J. & Kumar, S. Hyaluronic acid: incorporating the bio into the material. *ACS Biomater. Sci. Eng.* **5**, 3753–3765 (2019).
- Burdick, J. A. & Prestwich, G. D. Hyaluronic acid hydrogels for biomedical applications. *Adv. Mater.* **23**, H41–H56 (2011).
- Vogel, V. Mechanotransduction involving multimodular proteins: converting force into biochemical signals. *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct.* **35**, 459–488 (2006).
- Kong Hyun, J., Polte Thomas, R., Alsberg, E. & Mooney David, J. FRET measurements of cell-traction forces and nano-scale clustering of adhesion ligands varied by substrate stiffness. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **102**, 4300–4305 (2005).
- Huebsch, N. et al. Harnessing traction-mediated manipulation of the cell/matrix interface to control stem-cell fate. *Nat. Mater.* **9**, 518–526 (2010).
- Using hydrogels to tune stiffness independently of ligand density, the authors demonstrate that ECM stiffness directs stem cell fate in 3D through integrin clustering.**
- Chaudhuri, O. et al. Hydrogels with tunable stress relaxation regulate stem cell fate and activity. *Nat. Mater.* **15**, 326–334 (2016).
- By developing hydrogels of the same initial stiffness but independently tunable stress relaxation and using these for 3D cell culture, the authors show that stress relaxation (viscoelasticity) impacted cell spreading, proliferation and differentiation of MSCs.**
- Indana, D., Agarwal, P., Bhutani, N. & Chaudhuri, O. Viscoelasticity and adhesion signaling in biomaterials control human pluripotent stem cell morphogenesis in 3D culture. *Adv. Mater.* **33**, 2101966 (2021).
- Raeber, G. P., Lutolf, M. P. & Hubbell, J. A. Molecularly engineered PEG hydrogels: a novel model system for proteolytically mediated cell migration. *Biophys. J.* **89**, 1374–1388 (2005).
- This study uses polyethylene glycol-based hydrogels engineered to be susceptible to proteolytic degradation by cell-secreted matrix metalloproteinases to show that increased matrix degradability promotes cell migration.**
- Rowley, J. A., Madhambayan, G. & Mooney, D. J. Alginate hydrogels as synthetic extracellular matrix materials. *Biomaterials* **20**, 45–53 (1999).
- Kubow, K. E. et al. Mechanical forces regulate the interactions of fibronectin and collagen I in extracellular matrix. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8026 (2015).

45. Baneyx, G., Baugh, L. & Vogel, V. Fibronectin extension and unfolding within cell matrix fibrils controlled by cytoskeletal tension. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **99**, 5139–5143 (2002).
46. Miroshnikova, Y. A. et al. Tissue mechanics promote IDH1-dependent HIF1 α -tenascin C feedback to regulate glioblastoma aggression. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **18**, 1336–1345 (2016).
47. Wishart, A. L. et al. Decellularized extracellular matrix scaffolds identify full-length collagen VI as a driver of breast cancer cell invasion in obesity and metastasis. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eabc3175 (2020).
48. Papanicolaou, M. et al. Temporal profiling of the breast tumour microenvironment reveals collagen XII as a driver of metastasis. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 4587 (2022).
49. Lai, V. K. et al. Swelling of collagen-hyaluronic acid co-gels: an in vitro residual stress model. *Ann. Biomed. Eng.* **44**, 2984–2993 (2016).
50. Burla, F., Tauber, J., Dussi, S., van der Gucht, J. & Koenderink, G. H. Stress management in composite biopolymer networks. *Nat. Phys.* **15**, 549–553 (2019).
- Lai et al. (2016) and Burla et al. (2019) show the emergent properties of composite materials consisting of col-1 and HA.**
51. Coccione, A. J. et al. Elastin, arterial mechanics, and cardiovascular disease. *Am. J. Physiol. Heart Circ. Physiol.* **315**, H189–H205 (2018).
52. Chaudhuri, O., Cooper-White, J., Janmey, P. A., Mooney, D. J. & Shenoy, V. B. Effects of extracellular matrix viscoelasticity on cellular behaviour. *Nature* **584**, 535–546 (2020).
53. Chen, D. et al. Distinct effects of different matrix proteoglycans on collagen fibrillogenesis and cell-mediated collagen reorganization. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 19065 (2020).
54. Han Yu, L. et al. Cell contraction induces long-ranged stress stiffening in the extracellular matrix. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **115**, 4075–4080 (2018).
- Using optical tweezers, the authors demonstrate that cells use their contractile forces to mechanically remodel their local microenvironments into stiffer environments.**
55. van Oosten, A. S. G. et al. Emergence of tissue-like mechanics from fibrous networks confined by close-packed cells. *Nature* **573**, 96–101 (2019).
- This article demonstrates that a composite of ECM and densely packed cells gives rise to compression stiffening, whereas pure ECM exhibited compression softening, highlighting the role of cells in tissue mechanics.**
56. Engler, A. J., Sen, S., Sweeney, H. L. & Discher, D. E. Matrix elasticity directs stem cell lineage specification. *Cell* **126**, 677–689 (2006).
57. Davidson, M. D. et al. Engineered fibrous networks to investigate the influence of fiber mechanics on myofibroblast differentiation. *ACS Biomater. Sci. Eng.* **5**, 3899–3908 (2019).
58. Yamada, K. M. & Sixt, M. Mechanisms of 3D cell migration. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **20**, 738–752 (2019).
59. Paul, C. D., Mistriotis, P. & Konstantopoulos, K. Cancer cell motility: lessons from migration in confined spaces. *Nat. Rev. Cancer* **17**, 131–140 (2017).
60. Khetan, S. et al. Degradation-mediated cellular traction directs stem cell fate in covalently crosslinked three-dimensional hydrogels. *Nat. Mater.* **12**, 458–465 (2013).
- In this seminal work, by changing hydrogel degradability and maintaining the same initial stiffness, the authors demonstrate that hydrogel degradability-mediated cell traction directs stem cell fate in 3D microenvironments.**
61. Lee, H.-P., Stowers, R. & Chaudhuri, O. Volume expansion and TRPV4 activation regulate stem cell fate in three-dimensional microenvironments. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 529 (2019).
- This study identifies a mechanosensitive ion channel-mediated mechanism that MSCs use to sense matrix. Fast stress relaxation promoted reciprocal cell volume expansion and activation of TRPV4 mechanosensitive ion channels to drive nuclear translocation of RUNX2 and osteogenic differentiation.**
62. Yang, B. et al. Enhanced mechanosensing of cells in synthetic 3D matrix with controlled biophysical dynamics. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 3514 (2021).
63. Engler, A. et al. Substrate compliance versus ligand density in cell on gel responses. *Biophys. J.* **86**, 617–628 (2004).
64. Chen Christopher, S., Mrksich, M., Huang, S., Whitesides George, M. & Ingber Donald, E. Geometric control of cell life and death. *Science* **276**, 1425–1428 (1997).
65. Gjorevski, N. et al. Tissue geometry drives deterministic organoid patterning. *Science* **375**, eaaw9021 (2022).
66. Wang, M. et al. Regulating mechanotransduction in three dimensions using sub-cellular scale, crosslinkable fibers of controlled diameter, stiffness, and alignment. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **29**, 1808967 (2019).
67. Bodor, D. L., Pöschel, W., Endres, R. G. & Paluch, E. K. Of cell shapes and motion: the physical basis of animal cell migration. *Dev. Cell* **52**, 550–562 (2020).
68. Peyton, S. R. & Putnam, A. J. Extracellular matrix rigidity governs smooth muscle cell motility in a biphasic fashion. *J. Cell. Physiol.* **204**, 198–209 (2005).
69. Pelham Robert, J. & Wang, Y.-I. Cell locomotion and focal adhesions are regulated by substrate flexibility. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **94**, 13661–13665 (1997).
70. Gardel, M. L. et al. Traction stress in focal adhesions correlates biphasically with actin retrograde flow speed. *J. Cell Biol.* **183**, 999–1005 (2008).
71. Sunyer, R. et al. Collective cell durotaxis emerges from long-range intercellular force transmission. *Science* **353**, 1157–1161 (2016).
72. Isomursu, A. et al. Directed cell migration towards softer environments. *Nat. Mater.* **21**, 1081–1090 (2022).
73. Wolf, K. et al. Physical limits of cell migration: Control by ECM space and nuclear deformation and tuning by proteolysis and traction force. *J. Cell Biol.* **201**, 1069–1084 (2013).
74. Harada, T. et al. Nuclear lamin stiffness is a barrier to 3D migration, but softness can limit survival. *J. Cell Biol.* **204**, 669–682 (2014).
- Wolf et al. (2013) and Harada et al. (2014) show that matrix pore size regulates cell migration, with cells unable to migrate through pores smaller than 3 μ m in diameter in elastic non-degradable gels.**
75. Fraley, S. I. et al. Three-dimensional matrix fiber alignment modulates cell migration and MT1-MMP utility by spatially and temporally directing protrusions. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 14580 (2015).
76. Trappmann, B. et al. Matrix degradability controls multicellularity of 3D cell migration. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 371 (2017).
77. Wisdom, K. M. et al. Matrix mechanical plasticity regulates cancer cell migration through confining microenvironments. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 4144 (2018).
- Using nanoporous hydrogels with tunable mechanical plasticity, the authors discover that cells can migrate through nanoporous matrices independently of proteases if the matrix exhibits sufficient matrix mechanical plasticity.**
78. Lee, H.-P. et al. The nuclear piston activates mechanosensitive ion channels to generate cell migration paths in confining microenvironments. *Sci. Adv.* **7**, eabd4058 (2021).
79. Petrie, R. J., Harlin, H. M., Korsak, L. I. T. & Yamada, K. M. Activating the nuclear piston mechanism of 3D migration in tumor cells. *J. Cell Biol.* **216**, 93–100 (2016).
80. Polacheck, W. J., German, A. E., Mammoto, A., Ingber, D. E. & Kamm, R. D. Mechanotransduction of fluid stresses governs 3D cell migration. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 2447–2452 (2014).
81. Blache, U., Stevens, M. M. & Gentleman, E. Harnessing the secreted extracellular matrix to engineer tissues. *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* **4**, 357–363 (2020).
82. Loebel, C., Mauck, R. L. & Burdick, J. A. Local nascent protein deposition and remodelling guide mesenchymal stromal cell mechanosensing and fate in three-dimensional hydrogels. *Nat. Mater.* **18**, 883–891 (2019).
83. Ferreira, S. A. et al. Bi-directional cell-pericellular matrix interactions direct stem cell fate. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 4049 (2018).
- Loebel et al. (2019) and Ferreira et al. (2018) demonstrate the role of nascent proteins secreted by cells in 3D as a key regulator of various mechanosensing behaviours such as cell spread area, YAP and TAZ nuclear translocation, and osteogenic differentiation.**
84. Lee, H.-P., Gu, L., Mooney, D. J., Levenston, M. E. & Chaudhuri, O. Mechanical confinement regulates cartilage matrix formation by chondrocytes. *Nat. Mater.* **16**, 1243–1251 (2017).
85. Borelli, A. N. et al. Stress relaxation and composition of hydrazone-crosslinked hybrid biopolymer-synthetic hydrogels determine spreading and secretory properties of MSCs. *Adv. Healthc. Mater.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.202200393> (2022).
86. Sridhar, B. V. et al. Development of a cellularly degradable PEG hydrogel to promote articular cartilage extracellular matrix deposition. *Adv. Healthc. Mater.* **4**, 702–713 (2015).
87. Vining, K. H. & Mooney, D. J. Mechanical forces direct stem cell behaviour in development and regeneration. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **18**, 728–742 (2017).
88. Engler, A. J. et al. Myotubes differentiate optimally on substrates with tissue-like stiffness: pathological implications for soft or stiff microenvironments. *J. Cell Biol.* **166**, 877–887 (2004).
89. Fu, J. et al. Mechanical regulation of cell function with geometrically modulated elastomeric substrates. *Nat. Methods* **7**, 733–736 (2010).
90. Wen, J. H. et al. Interplay of matrix stiffness and protein tethering in stem cell differentiation. *Nat. Mater.* **13**, 979–987 (2014).
91. Saha, K. et al. Substrate modulus directs neural stem cell behavior. *Biophys. J.* **95**, 4426–4438 (2008).
92. Gilbert, P. M. et al. Substrate elasticity regulates skeletal muscle stem cell self-renewal in culture. *Science* **329**, 1078–1081 (2010).
93. Ye, K. et al. Matrix stiffness and nanoscale spatial organization of cell-adhesive ligands direct stem cell fate. *Nano Lett.* **15**, 4720–4729 (2015).
94. Yang, C. et al. Spatially patterned matrix elasticity directs stem cell fate. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, E4439–E4445 (2016).
95. Charrier, E. E., Pogoda, K., Wells, R. G. & Janmey, P. A. Control of cell morphology and differentiation by substrates with independently tunable elasticity and viscous dissipation. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 449 (2018).
96. Cameron, A. R., Frith, J. E. & Cooper-White, J. J. The influence of substrate creep on mesenchymal stem cell behaviour and phenotype. *Biomaterials* **32**, 5979–5993 (2011).
97. Stanton, A. E., Tong, X. & Yang, F. Extracellular matrix type modulates mechanotransduction of stem cells. *Acta Biomater.* **96**, 310–320 (2019).
98. Kilian, K. A., Bugarja, B., Lahn, B. T. & Mrksich, M. Geometric cues for directing the differentiation of mesenchymal stem cells. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **107**, 4872–4877 (2010).
99. Muncie, J. M. et al. Mechanical tension promotes formation of gastrulation-like nodes and patterns mesoderm specification in human embryonic stem cells. *Dev. Cell* **55**, 679–694.e611 (2020).
100. Das, R. K., Gocheva, V., Hammink, R., Zouani, O. F. & Rowan, A. E. Stress-stiffening-mediated stem-cell commitment switch in soft responsive hydrogels. *Nat. Mater.* **15**, 318–325 (2016).
101. Hayward, M.-K., Muncie, J. M. & Weaver, V. M. Tissue mechanics in stem cell fate, development, and cancer. *Dev. Cell* **56**, 1833–1847 (2021).
102. Shao, Y., Sang, J. & Fu, J. On human pluripotent stem cell control: the rise of 3D bioengineering and mechanobiology. *Biomaterials* **52**, 26–43 (2015).
103. Madl, C. M. et al. Maintenance of neural progenitor cell stemness in 3D hydrogels requires matrix remodelling. *Nat. Mater.* **16**, 1233–1242 (2017).
- This article demonstrates that increased ECM degradability in 3D allows cell-cell contact formation, which helps to maintain neural progenitor cell stemness, in the absence of cytoskeletal tension generation.**
104. Vining, K. H. et al. Mechanical checkpoint regulates monocyte differentiation in fibrotic niches. *Nat. Mater.* **21**, 939–950 (2022).

105. Klein, E. A. et al. Cell-cycle control by physiological matrix elasticity and in vivo tissue stiffening. *Curr. Biol.* **19**, 1511–1518 (2009).
106. Nam, S. et al. Cell cycle progression in confining microenvironments is regulated by a growth-responsive TRPV4-PI3K/Akt-p27Kip1 signaling axis. *Sci. Adv.* **5**, eaaw6171 (2019).
107. Dudaryeva, O. Y. et al. 3D confinement regulates cell life and death. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **31**, 2104098 (2021).
108. Kratochvil, M. J. et al. Engineered materials for organoid systems. *Nat. Rev. Mater.* **4**, 606–622 (2019).
109. Rezakhani, S., Gjorevski, N. & Lutolf, M. P. Extracellular matrix requirements for gastrointestinal organoid cultures. *Biomaterials* **276**, 121020 (2021).
110. Enemchukwu, N. O. et al. Synthetic matrices reveal contributions of ECM biophysical and biochemical properties to epithelial morphogenesis. *J. Cell Biol.* **212**, 113–124 (2015).
111. Gjorevski, N. et al. Designer matrices for intestinal stem cell and organoid culture. *Nature* **539**, 560–564 (2016).
112. Cruz-Acuña, R. et al. Synthetic hydrogels for human intestinal organoid generation and colonic wound repair. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **19**, 1326–1335 (2017).
- Gjorevski et al. (2016) and Cruz-Acuña et al. (2017) demonstrate the use of 3D culture in engineered hydrogels for guiding morphogenesis of stem cells, highlighting the role of hydrogel degradability.**
113. Ranga, A. et al. Neural tube morphogenesis in synthetic 3D microenvironments. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, E6831–E6839 (2016).
114. Blatchley, M. R., Hall, F., Wang, S., Pruitt, H. C. & Gerecht, S. Hypoxia and matrix viscoelasticity sequentially regulate endothelial progenitor cluster-based vasculogenesis. *Sci. Adv.* **5**, eaau7518 (2019).
- Blatchley et al. (2019) and Indana et al. (2021) demonstrate the use of 3D culture in engineered hydrogels for guiding morphogenesis of stem cells, highlighting the role of hydrogel viscoelasticity.**
115. Chrisnandy, A., Blondel, D., Rezakhani, S., Brogiere, N. & Lutolf, M. P. Synthetic dynamic hydrogels promote degradation-independent in vitro organogenesis. *Nat. Mater.* **21**, 479–487 (2022).
116. Sorrentino, G. et al. Mechano-modulatory synthetic niches for liver organoid derivation. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 3416 (2020).
117. Kai, F., Drain, A. P. & Weaver, V. M. The extracellular matrix modulates the metastatic journey. *Dev. Cell* **49**, 332–346 (2019).
118. Provenzano, P. P. et al. Collagen density promotes mammary tumor initiation and progression. *BMC Med.* **6**, 11 (2008).
119. Paszek, M. J. et al. Tensional homeostasis and the malignant phenotype. *Cancer Cell* **8**, 241–254 (2005).
- In this multifaceted work that uses both 2D and 3D cell culture studies, the authors show that increased stiffness and collagen density, as occurs during breast cancer progression, promotes a malignant phenotype in even normal mammary epithelial cells through $\beta 1$ integrin clustering, Rho and FAK activation.**
120. Levental, K. R. et al. Matrix crosslinking forces tumor progression by enhancing integrin signaling. *Cell* **139**, 891–906 (2009).
121. Wei, S. C. et al. Matrix stiffness drives epithelial–mesenchymal transition and tumour metastasis through a TWIST1–G3BP2 mechanotransduction pathway. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **17**, 678–688 (2015).
122. Chaudhuri, O. et al. Extracellular matrix stiffness and composition jointly regulate the induction of malignant phenotypes in mammary epithelium. *Nat. Mater.* **13**, 970–978 (2014).
123. Tse, J. M. et al. Mechanical compression drives cancer cells toward invasive phenotype. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 911–916 (2012).
124. Kim, J. et al. Geometric dependence of 3D collective cancer invasion. *Biophys. J.* **118**, 1177–1182 (2020).
125. Debnath, J. & Brugge, J. S. Modelling glandular epithelial cancers in three-dimensional cultures. *Nat. Rev. Cancer* **5**, 675–688 (2005).
126. Lee, J. Y. et al. YAP-independent mechanotransduction drives breast cancer progression. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 1848 (2019).
- In contrast to the universal role of YAP in mediating mechanotransduction on 2D substrates, this article demonstrates that increased stiffness promotes malignancy in mammary epithelial cells independently of YAP in 3D culture, which is consistent with in vivo analysis of breast cancer, and connected this observation to the lack of focal adhesions, stress fibres and stretched nuclei in 3D.**
127. Stowers, R. S. et al. Matrix stiffness induces a tumorigenic phenotype in mammary epithelium through changes in chromatin accessibility. *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* **3**, 1009–1019 (2019).
- The authors demonstrate changes in chromatin accessibility in breast cancer cells with a change in ECM stiffness in 3D, and these changes allow binding of the transcription factor Sp1 to promote a malignant phenotype, revealing that chromatin state is a critical mediator of mechanotransduction.**
128. Long, H., Vos, B. E., Betz, T., Baker, B. M. & Trappmann, B. Nonswelling and hydrolytically stable hydrogels uncover cellular mechanosensing in 3D. *Adv. Sci.* **9**, 2105325 (2022).
129. Lou, J., Stowers, R., Nam, S., Xia, Y. & Chaudhuri, O. Stress relaxing hyaluronic acid-collagen hydrogels promote cell spreading, fiber remodeling, and focal adhesion formation in 3D cell culture. *Biomaterials* **154**, 213–222 (2018).
130. Caliri, S. R., Vega, S. L., Kwon, M., Soulas, E. M. & Burdick, J. A. Dimensionality and spreading influence MSC YAP/TAZ signaling in hydrogel environments. *Biomaterials* **103**, 314–323 (2016).
131. Nam, S., Lee, J., Brownfield, Doug, G. & Chaudhuri, O. Viscoplasticity enables mechanical remodeling of matrix by cells. *Biophys. J.* **111**, 2296–2308 (2016).
132. Qazi, T. H. et al. Programming hydrogels to probe spatiotemporal cell biology. *Cell Stem Cell* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stem.2022.03.013> (2022).
133. Schultz, K. M., Kyburz, K. A. & Anseth, K. S. Measuring dynamic cell–material interactions and remodeling during 3D human mesenchymal stem cell migration in hydrogels. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, E3757–E3764 (2015).
134. Sabeh, F., Shimizu-Hirota, R. & Weiss, S. J. Protease-dependent versus -independent cancer cell invasion programs: three-dimensional amoeboid movement revisited. *J. Cell Biol.* **185**, 11–19 (2009).
135. McKinnon, D. D., Domaille, D. W., Cha, J. N. & Anseth, K. S. Biophysically defined and cytocompatible covalently adaptable networks as viscoelastic 3D cell culture systems. *Adv. Mater.* **26**, 865–872 (2014).
136. Nam, S. & Chaudhuri, O. Mitotic cells generate protrusive extracellular forces to divide in three-dimensional microenvironments. *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 621–628 (2018).
137. Legant, W. R. et al. Measurement of mechanical tractions exerted by cells in three-dimensional matrices. *Nat. Methods* **7**, 969–971 (2010).
138. Franck, C., Maskarinec, S. A., Tirrell, D. A. & Ravichandran, G. Three-dimensional traction force microscopy: a new tool for quantifying cell–matrix interactions. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e17833 (2011).
139. Steinwachs, J. et al. Three-dimensional force microscopy of cells in biopolymer networks. *Nat. Methods* **13**, 171–176 (2016).
140. Bell, E., Ivarsson, B. & Merrill, C. Production of a tissue-like structure by contraction of collagen lattices by human fibroblasts of different proliferative potential in vitro. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **76**, 1274–1278 (1979).
141. Fletcher, D. A. & Mullins, R. D. Cell mechanics and the cytoskeleton. *Nature* **463**, 485–492 (2010).
142. Papalazarou, V. & Machesky, L. M. The cell pushes back: the Arp2/3 complex is a key orchestrator of cellular responses to environmental forces. *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **68**, 37–44 (2021).
143. Gaertner, F. et al. WASP triggers mechanosensitive actin patches to facilitate immune cell migration in dense tissues. *Dev. Cell* **57**, 47–62.e49 (2022).
144. Nam, S., Lin, Y.-H., Kim, T. & Chaudhuri, O. Cellular pushing forces during mitosis drive mitotic elongation in collagen gels. *Adv. Sci.* **8**, 2000403 (2021).
145. Hoffmann, E. K., Lambert, I. H. & Pedersen, S. F. Physiology of cell volume regulation in vertebrates. *Physiol. Rev.* **89**, 193–277 (2009).
146. Ginzberg Miriam, B., Kafri, R. & Kirschner, M. On being the right (cell) size. *Science* **348**, 1245075 (2015).
147. Adar Ram, M. & Safran Samuel, A. Active volume regulation in adhered cells. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **117**, 5604–5609 (2020).
148. Petrie, R. J., Koo, H. & Yamada Kenneth, M. Generation of compartmentalized pressure by a nuclear piston governs cell motility in a 3D matrix. *Science* **345**, 1062–1065 (2014).
- In contrast to the conventional thinking that the nucleus acts a limiting factor for cell migration in 3D, Petrie et al. (2014) and Lee et al. (2021) drives the nucleus like a piston into the protrusion. This action activates mechanosensitive ion channels to allow an influx of ions that increases osmotic pressure, which then outcompetes hydrostatic pressure to drive protrusion expansion, generating a path for migration in confining 3D microenvironments.**
149. Stroka, K. M. et al. Water permeation drives tumor cell migration in confined microenvironments. *Cell* **157**, 611–623 (2014).
150. Helmlinger, G., Netti, P. A., Lichtenbeld, H. C., Melder, R. J. & Jain, R. K. Solid stress inhibits the growth of multicellular tumor spheroids. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **15**, 778–783 (1997).
151. Nia, H. T. et al. Solid stress and elastic energy as measures of tumour mechanopathology. *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* **1**, 0004 (2016).
152. Kasza, K. E. et al. The cell as a material. *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **19**, 101–107 (2007).
153. Jung, W., Li, J., Chaudhuri, O. & Kim, T. Nonlinear elastic and inelastic properties of cells. *J. Biomech. Eng.* <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4046863> (2020).
154. Guo, M. et al. Cell volume change through water efflux impacts cell stiffness and stem cell fate. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, E8618–E8627 (2017).
155. Lomakin, A. J. et al. The nucleus acts as a ruler tailoring cell responses to spatial constraints. *Science* **370**, eaba2894 (2020).
156. Venturini, V. et al. The nucleus measures shape changes for cellular proprioception to control dynamic cell behavior. *Science* **370**, eaba2644 (2020).
157. Heo, S.-J. et al. Nuclear softening expedites interstitial cell migration in fibrous networks and dense connective tissues. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaax5083 (2020).
158. Doyle, A. D., Carvajal, N., Jin, A., Matsumoto, K. & Yamada, K. M. Local 3D matrix microenvironment regulates cell migration through spatiotemporal dynamics of contractility-dependent adhesions. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8720 (2015).
159. Hall Matthew, S. et al. Fibrous nonlinear elasticity enables positive mechanical feedback between cells and ECMs. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 14043–14048 (2016).
160. Doyle, A. D., Sykora, D. J., Pacheco, G. G., Kutys, M. L. & Yamada, K. M. 3D mesenchymal cell migration is driven by anterior cellular contraction that generates an extracellular matrix prestrain. *Dev. Cell* **56**, 826–841.e824 (2021).
161. Petrie, R. J., Gavara, N., Chadwick, R. S. & Yamada, K. M. Nonpolarized signaling reveals two distinct modes of 3D cell migration. *J. Cell Biol.* **197**, 439–455 (2012).
162. Gong, Z. et al. Recursive feedback between matrix dissipation and chemo-mechanical signaling drives oscillatory growth of cancer cell invadopodia. *Cell Rep.* **35**, 109047 (2021).
- In this study, the authors use a chemomechanical model to study cell–matrix interactions and find protrusive forces generated by cells through invadopodia**

- deform the matrix and in sufficiently plastic matrices such forces lead to permanent matrix deformations, which in turn promote growth of protrusions and result in larger pores for cell migration.**
163. Gong, Z. et al. Matching material and cellular timescales maximizes cell spreading on viscoelastic substrates. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **115**, E2686–E2695 (2018).
 164. Blache, U. et al. Notch-inducing hydrogels reveal a perivascular switch of mesenchymal stem cell fate. *EMBO Rep.* **19**, e45964 (2018).
 165. Provenzano, P. P., Inman, D. R., Eliceiri, K. W. & Keely, P. J. Matrix density-induced mechanoregulation of breast cell phenotype, signaling and gene expression through a FAK–ERK linkage. *Oncogene* **28**, 4326–4343 (2009).
 166. Wei, Z., Schnellmann, R., Pruitt, H. C. & Gerecht, S. Hydrogel network dynamics regulate vascular morphogenesis. *Cell Stem Cell* **27**, 798–812.e796 (2020).
 167. Parekh, S. H. et al. Modulus-driven differentiation of marrow stromal cells in 3D scaffolds that is independent of myosin-based cytoskeletal tension. *Biomaterials* **32**, 2256–2264 (2011).
 168. Bao, M., Xie, J., Piruska, A. & Huck, W. T. S. 3D microniches reveal the importance of cell size and shape. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 1962 (2017).
 169. Agarwal, P. et al. A dysfunctional TRPV4–GSK3 β pathway prevents osteoarthritic chondrocytes from sensing changes in extracellular matrix viscoelasticity. *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* **5**, 1472–1484 (2021).
 170. Batan, D. et al. Hydrogel cultures reveal transient receptor potential vanilloid 4 regulation of myofibroblast activation and proliferation in valvular interstitial cells. *FASEB J.* **36**, e22306 (2022).
 171. Wong, S. W. et al. Controlled deposition of 3D matrices to direct single cell functions. *Adv. Sci.* **7**, 2001066 (2020).
 172. Murthy, S. E., Dubin, A. E. & Patapoutian, A. Piezos thrive under pressure: mechanically activated ion channels in health and disease. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **18**, 771–783 (2017).
 173. Zhao, R. et al. Cell sensing and decision-making in confinement: the role of TRPM7 in a tug of war between hydraulic pressure and cross-sectional area. *Sci. Adv.* **5**, eaaw7243 (2019).
 174. Yankaskas, C. L. et al. The fluid shear stress sensor TRPM7 regulates tumor cell intravasation. *Sci. Adv.* **7**, eabh3457 (2021).
 175. Kalukula, Y., Stephens, A. D., Lammerding, J. & Gabriele, S. Mechanics and functional consequences of nuclear deformations. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-022-00480-z> (2022).
 176. Cosgrove, B. D. et al. Nuclear envelope wrinkling predicts mesenchymal progenitor cell mechano-response in 2D and 3D microenvironments. *Biomaterials* **270**, 120662 (2021).
 177. Darnell, M. et al. Material microenvironmental properties couple to induce distinct transcriptional programs in mammalian stem cells. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **115**, E8368–E8377 (2018).
 178. Jang, M. et al. Matrix stiffness epigenetically regulates the oncogenic activation of the Yes-associated protein in gastric cancer. *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* **5**, 114–123 (2021).
 179. Baek, J. et al. Egr1 is a 3D matrix-specific mediator of mechanosensitive stem cell lineage commitment. *Sci. Adv.* **8**, eabm4646 (2022).
 - This article demonstrates upregulation of EGR1, which mediates neural stem cell differentiation, is unique to 3D, highlighting EGR1 as a 3D-specific stem cell mechanoregulatory factor.**
 180. Wong, S. W., Lenzini, S., Cooper, M. H., Mooney, D. J. & Shin, J.-W. Soft extracellular matrix enhances inflammatory activation of mesenchymal stromal cells to induce monocyte production and trafficking. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaaw0158 (2020).
 181. Walker, C. J. et al. Nuclear mechanosensing drives chromatin remodelling in persistently activated fibroblasts. *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* **5**, 1485–1499 (2021).
 182. Madl, C. M., LeSavage, B. L., Khariton, M. & Heilshorn, S. C. Neural progenitor cells alter chromatin organization and neurotrophin expression in response to 3D matrix degradability. *Adv. Healthc. Mater.* **9**, 2000754 (2020).
 183. Stooke-Vaughan, G. A. & Campàs, O. Physical control of tissue morphogenesis across scales. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* **51**, 111–119 (2018).
 184. Serwane, F. et al. In vivo quantification of spatially varying mechanical properties in developing tissues. *Nat. Methods* **14**, 181–186 (2017).
 185. Bedzhov, I. & Zernicka-Goetz, M. Self-organizing properties of mouse pluripotent cells initiate morphogenesis upon implantation. *Cell* **156**, 1032–1044 (2014).
 186. Kyprianou, C. et al. Basement membrane remodelling regulates mouse embryogenesis. *Nature* **582**, 253–258 (2020).
 187. Rauzi, M. et al. Embryo-scale tissue mechanics during Drosophila gastrulation movements. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8677 (2015).
 188. Hannezo, E. & Heisenberg, C.-P. Rigidity transitions in development and disease. *Trends Cell Biol.* **32**, 433–444 (2022).
 189. Kim, S., Pochitaloff, M., Stooke-Vaughan, G. A. & Campàs, O. Embryonic tissues as active foams. *Nat. Phys.* **17**, 859–866 (2021).
 190. Priya, R. et al. Tension heterogeneity directs form and fate to pattern the myocardial wall. *Nature* **588**, 130–134 (2020).
 191. Shellard, A. & Mayor, R. Collective durotaxis along a self-generated stiffness gradient in vivo. *Nature* **600**, 690–694 (2021).
 - This article demonstrates that cells collectively generate stiffness gradients in vivo that result in efficient collective cell migration.**
 192. Wang, S., Matsumoto, K., Lish, S. R., Cartagena-Rivera, A. X. & Yamada, K. M. Budding epithelial morphogenesis driven by cell-matrix versus cell-cell adhesion. *Cell* **184**, 3702–3716.e3730 (2021).
 193. Hughes, A. J. et al. Engineered tissue folding by mechanical compaction of the mesenchyme. *Dev. Cell* **44**, 165–178.e166 (2018).
 194. Webster, K. D., Ng, W. P. & Fletcher, D. A. Tensional homeostasis in single fibroblasts. *Biophys. J.* **107**, 146–155 (2014).
 195. Grinnell, F. Fibroblast biology in three-dimensional collagen matrices. *Trends Cell Biol.* **13**, 264–269 (2003).
 196. Jaalouk, D. E. & Lammerding, J. Mechanotransduction gone awry. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **10**, 63–73 (2009).
 197. Choudhury, M. I. et al. Kidney epithelial cells are active mechano-biological fluid pumps. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 2317 (2022).
 198. Qian, W. et al. Microskeletal stiffness promotes aortic aneurysm by sustaining pathological vascular smooth muscle cell mechanosensation via Piezo1. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 512 (2022).
 199. Darnell, M. et al. Substrate stress-relaxation regulates scaffold remodeling and bone formation in vivo. *Adv. Healthc. Mater.* **6**, 1601185 (2017).
 200. Phillip, J. M., Aifuwa, I., Walston, J. & Wirtz, D. The mechanobiology of aging. *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* **17**, 113–141 (2015).
 201. Khalilgharibi, N. & Mao, Y. To form and function: on the role of basement membrane mechanics in tissue development, homeostasis and disease. *Open. Biol.* **11**, 200360 (2021).
 202. Brun, C. et al. Phenotypic and functional changes in dermal primary fibroblasts isolated from intrinsically aged human skin. *Exp. Dermatol.* **25**, 113–119 (2016).
 203. Phillip, J. M. et al. Fractional re-distribution among cell motility states during ageing. *Commun. Biol.* **4**, 81 (2021).
 204. Humphrey, J. D. & Schwartz, M. A. Vascular mechanobiology: homeostasis, adaptation, and disease. *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* **23**, 1–27 (2021).
 205. Hall, C. M., Moenendary, E. & Sheridan, G. K. Mechanobiology of the brain in ageing and Alzheimer's disease. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* **53**, 3851–3878 (2021).
 206. Wynn, T. A. Fibrotic disease and the TH1/TH2 paradigm. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* **4**, 583–594 (2004).
 207. Seo, B. R. et al. Collagen microarchitecture mechanically controls myofibroblast differentiation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **117**, 11387–11398 (2020).
 208. Freeberg, M. A. T. et al. Mechanical feed-forward loops contribute to idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. *Am. J. Pathol.* **191**, 18–25 (2021).
 209. Bissell, M. J. & Hines, W. C. Why don't we get more cancer? A proposed role of the microenvironment in restraining cancer progression. *Nat. Med.* **17**, 320–329 (2011).
 210. Piersma, B., Hayward, M.-K. & Weaver, V. M. Fibrosis and cancer: a strained relationship. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta Rev. Cancer* **1873**, 188356 (2020).
 211. Acerbi, I. et al. Human breast cancer invasion and aggression correlates with ECM stiffening and immune cell infiltration. *Integr. Biol.* **7**, 1120–1134 (2015).
 212. Calvo, F. et al. Mechanotransduction and YAP-dependent matrix remodelling is required for the generation and maintenance of cancer-associated fibroblasts. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **15**, 637–646 (2013).
 213. Maller, O. et al. Tumour-associated macrophages drive stromal cell-dependent collagen crosslinking and stiffening to promote breast cancer aggression. *Nat. Mater.* **20**, 548–559 (2021).
 214. Provenzano, P. P. et al. Collagen reorganization at the tumor-stromal interface facilitates local invasion. *BMC Med.* **4**, 38 (2006).
 215. Laklai, H. et al. Genotype tunes pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma tissue tension to induce matricellular fibrosis and tumor progression. *Nat. Med.* **22**, 497–505 (2016).
 216. Jiang, H. et al. Targeting focal adhesion kinase renders pancreatic cancers responsive to checkpoint immunotherapy. *Nat. Med.* **22**, 851–860 (2016).
 217. Baker, A. M., Bird, D., Lang, G., Cox, T. R. & Erler, J. T. Lysyl oxidase enzymatic function increases stiffness to drive colorectal cancer progression through FAK. *Oncogene* **32**, 1863–1868 (2013).
 218. Peng, D. H. et al. ZEB1 induces LOXL2-mediated collagen stabilization and deposition in the extracellular matrix to drive lung cancer invasion and metastasis. *Oncogene* **36**, 1925–1938 (2017).
 219. Chang, T. T., Thakar, D. & Weaver, V. M. Force-dependent breaching of the basement membrane. *Matrix Biol.* **57–58**, 178–189 (2017).
 220. Mittapalli, V. R. et al. Injury-driven stiffening of the dermis expedites skin carcinoma progression. *Cancer Res.* **76**, 940–951 (2016).
 221. Balleyguier, C. et al. Value of whole breast magnetic resonance elastography added to MRI for lesion characterization. *NMR Biomed.* **31**, e3795 (2018).
 222. Streitberger, K.-J. et al. High-resolution mechanical imaging of glioblastoma by multifrequency magnetic resonance elastography. *PLoS ONE* **9**, e110588 (2014).
 223. Garteiser, P. et al. MR elastography of liver tumours: value of viscoelastic properties for tumour characterisation. *Eur. Radiol.* **22**, 2169–2177 (2012).
 224. DeForest, C. A. & Tirrell, D. A. A photoreversible protein-patterning approach for guiding stem cell fate in three-dimensional gels. *Nat. Mater.* **14**, 523–531 (2015).
 225. Mao, A. S. et al. Deterministic encapsulation of single cells in thin tunable microgels for niche modelling and therapeutic delivery. *Nat. Mater.* **16**, 236–243 (2017).
 226. Chen, B.-C. et al. Lattice light-sheet microscopy: imaging molecules to embryos at high spatiotemporal resolution. *Science* **346**, 1257998 (2014).
 227. Welch, C. M., Elliott, H., Danuser, G. & Hahn, K. M. Imaging the coordination of multiple signalling activities in living cells. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **12**, 749–756 (2011).
 228. Han, K. et al. CRISPR screens in cancer spheroids identify 3D growth-specific vulnerabilities. *Nature* **580**, 136–141 (2020).

229. Noskovicova, N. et al. Suppression of the fibrotic encapsulation of silicone implants by inhibiting the mechanical activation of pro-fibrotic TGF- β . *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* **5**, 1437–1456 (2021).
230. Chen, K. et al. Disrupting mechanotransduction decreases fibrosis and contracture in split-thickness skin grafting. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **14**, eabj9152 (2022).
231. Umehara, T. et al. Female reproductive life span is extended by targeted removal of fibrotic collagen from the mouse ovary. *Sci. Adv.* **8**, eabn4564 (2022).
232. Winkler, J., Abisoye-Ogunniyan, A., Metcalfe, K. J. & Werb, Z. Concepts of extracellular matrix remodelling in tumour progression and metastasis. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 5120 (2020).
233. Madl, C. M., Heilshorn, S. C. & Blau, H. M. Bioengineering strategies to accelerate stem cell therapeutics. *Nature* **557**, 335–342 (2018).
234. Yeung, T. et al. Effects of substrate stiffness on cell morphology, cytoskeletal structure, and adhesion. *Cell Motil.* **60**, 24–34 (2005).
235. Branco da Cunha, C. et al. Influence of the stiffness of three-dimensional alginate/collagen-I interpenetrating networks on fibroblast biology. *Biomaterials* **35**, 8927–8936 (2014).
236. Stowers, R. S., Allen, S. C. & Suggs, L. J. Dynamic phototuning of 3D hydrogel stiffness. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 1953–1958 (2015).
237. Cameron, A. R., Frith, J. E., Gomez, G. A., Yap, A. S. & Cooper-White, J. J. The effect of time-dependent deformation of viscoelastic hydrogels on myogenic induction and Rac1 activity in mesenchymal stem cells. *Biomaterials* **35**, 1857–1868 (2014).
238. Chaudhuri, O. et al. Substrate stress relaxation regulates cell spreading. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 6365 (2015).
239. Huebsch, N. et al. Matrix elasticity of void-forming hydrogels controls transplanted-stem-cell-mediated bone formation. *Nat. Mater.* **14**, 1269–1277 (2015).
240. Trappmann, B. et al. Extracellular-matrix tethering regulates stem-cell fate. *Nat. Mater.* **11**, 642–649 (2012).
241. Hakkinen, K. M., Harunaga, J. S., Doyle, A. D. & Yamada, K. M. Direct comparisons of the morphology, migration, cell adhesions, and actin cytoskeleton of fibroblasts in four different three-dimensional extracellular matrices. *Tissue Eng. Part. A* **17**, 713–724 (2011).
242. McBeath, R., Pirone, D. M., Nelson, C. M., Bhadriraju, K. & Chen, C. S. Cell shape, cytoskeletal tension, and RhoA regulate stem cell lineage commitment. *Dev. Cell* **6**, 483–495 (2004).
243. Kassianidou, E. et al. Extracellular matrix geometry and initial adhesive position determine stress fiber network organization during cell spreading. *Cell Rep.* **27**, 1897–1909.e1894 (2019).
244. Ulrich, T. A., de Juan Pardo, E. M. & Kumar, S. The mechanical rigidity of the extracellular matrix regulates the structure, motility, and proliferation of glioma cells. *Cancer Res.* **69**, 4167–4174 (2009).
245. Raab, M. et al. Crawling from soft to stiff matrix polarizes the cytoskeleton and phosphoregulates myosin-II heavy chain. *J. Cell Biol.* **199**, 669–683 (2012).
246. Plotnikov, S. V., Pasapera, A. M., Sabass, B. & Waterman, C. M. Force fluctuations within focal adhesions mediate ECM-rigidity sensing to guide directed cell migration. *Cell* **151**, 1513–1527 (2012).
247. Ulrich, T. A., Jain, A., Tanner, K., MacKay, J. L. & Kumar, S. Probing cellular mechanobiology in three-dimensional culture with collagen–agarose matrices. *Biomaterials* **31**, 1875–1884 (2010).
248. Adebawale, K. et al. Enhanced substrate stress relaxation promotes filopodia-mediated cell migration. *Nat. Mater.* **20**, 1290–1299 (2021).
249. Hu, X. et al. Control cell migration by engineering integrin ligand assembly. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 5002 (2022).
250. Garbett, D. et al. T-Plastin reinforces membrane protrusions to bridge matrix gaps during cell migration. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 4818 (2020).
251. Reversat, A. et al. Cellular locomotion using environmental topography. *Nature* **582**, 582–585 (2020).
252. Kloxin, A. M., Kasko, A. M., Salinas, C. N. & Anseth, K. S. Photodegradable hydrogels for dynamic tuning of physical and chemical properties. *Science* **324**, 59–63 (2009).
253. Nikolaev, M. et al. Homeostatic mini-intestines through scaffold-guided organoid morphogenesis. *Nature* **585**, 574–578 (2020).
254. Mih, J. D., Marinkovic, A., Liu, F., Sharif, A. S. & Tschumperlin, D. J. Matrix stiffness reverses the effect of actomyosin tension on cell proliferation. *J. Cell Sci.* **125**, 5974–5983 (2012).
255. Han, W. M. et al. Synthetic matrix enhances transplanted satellite cell engraftment in dystrophic and aged skeletal muscle with comorbid trauma. *Sci. Adv.* **4**, eaar4008 (2018).
256. Vitiello, E. et al. Acto-myosin force organization modulates centriole separation and PLK4 recruitment to ensure centriole fidelity. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 52 (2019).
257. Moriarty, R. A. & Stroka, K. M. Physical confinement alters sarcoma cell cycle progression and division. *Cell Cycle* **17**, 2360–2373 (2018).
258. Qin, R. et al. Tumor suppressor DAPK1 catalyzes adhesion assembly on rigid but anoikis on soft matrices. *Front. Cell Dev. Biol.* <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcell.2022.959521> (2022).
259. Farrelly, N., Lee, Y.-J., Oliver, J., Dive, C. & Streuli, C. H. Extracellular matrix regulates apoptosis in mammary epithelium through a control on insulin signaling. *J. Cell Biol.* **144**, 1337–1348 (1999).
260. Indra, I. et al. An in vitro correlation of mechanical forces and metastatic capacity. *Phys. Biol.* **8**, 015015 (2011).
261. Kraning-Rush, C. M., Califano, J. P. & Reinhart-King, C. A. Cellular traction stresses increase with increasing metastatic potential. *PLoS ONE* **7**, e32572 (2012).
262. van den Berg, M. C. W. et al. Proteolytic and opportunistic breaching of the basement membrane zone by immune cells during tumor initiation. *Cell Rep.* **27**, 2837–2846.e2834 (2019).
263. Wolf, K. et al. Multi-step pericellular proteolysis controls the transition from individual to collective cancer cell invasion. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **9**, 893–904 (2007).
264. Shi, Q. et al. Rapid disorganization of mechanically interacting systems of mammary acini. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 658–663 (2014).
265. Lee, J., Abdeen, A. A., Wycislo, K. L., Fan, T. M. & Kilian, K. A. Interfacial geometry dictates cancer cell tumorigenicity. *Nat. Mater.* **15**, 856–862 (2016).
266. Hushka, E. A., Yavitt, F. M., Brown, T. E., Dempsey, P. J. & Anseth, K. S. Relaxation of extracellular matrix forces directs crypt formation and architecture in intestinal organoids. *Adv. Healthc. Mater.* **9**, 1901214 (2020).
267. Wang, W. Y. et al. Direct comparison of angiogenesis in natural and synthetic biomaterials reveals that matrix porosity regulates endothelial cell invasion speed and sprout diameter. *Acta Biomater.* **135**, 260–273 (2021).
268. Wang, C. C. B., Hung, C. T. & Mow, V. C. An analysis of the effects of depth-dependent aggregate modulus on articular cartilage stress-relaxation behavior in compression. *J. Biomech.* **34**, 75–84 (2001).
269. Charbonier, F., Indana, D. & Chaudhuri, O. Tuning viscoelasticity in alginate hydrogels for 3D cell culture studies. *Curr. Protoc.* **1**, e124 (2021).
270. Gjorevski, N. & Lutolf, M. P. Synthesis and characterization of well-defined hydrogel matrices and their application to intestinal stem cell and organoid culture. *Nat. Protoc.* **12**, 2263–2274 (2017).
271. Kloxin, A. M., Tibbitt, M. W. & Anseth, K. S. Synthesis of photodegradable hydrogels as dynamically tunable cell culture platforms. *Nat. Protoc.* **5**, 1867–1887 (2010).
272. Serban, M. A., Scott, A. & Prestwich, G. D. Use of hyaluronan-derived hydrogels for three-dimensional cell culture and tumor xenografts. *Curr. Protoc. Cell Biol.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471143030.cb1014s40> (2008).
273. Caliali, S. R. & Burdick, J. A. A practical guide to hydrogels for cell culture. *Nat. Methods* **13**, 405–414 (2016).
274. Correa, S. et al. Translational applications of hydrogels. *Chem. Rev.* **121**, 11385–11457 (2021).
275. Chan, C. E. & Odde, D. J. Traction dynamics of filopodia on compliant substrates. *Science* **322**, 1687–1691 (2008).
276. Elosegui-Artola, A. et al. Mechanical regulation of a molecular clutch defines force transmission and transduction in response to matrix rigidity. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **18**, 540–548 (2016).
277. Kanchanawong, P. et al. Nanoscale architecture of integrin-based cell adhesions. *Nature* **468**, 580–584 (2010).
278. Kumar, S. et al. Viscoelastic retraction of single living stress fibers and its impact on cell shape, cytoskeletal organization, and extracellular matrix mechanics. *Biophys. J.* **90**, 3762–3773 (2006).
279. del Rio, A. et al. Stretching single talin rod molecules activates vinculin binding. *Science* **323**, 638–641 (2009).
280. Grashoff, C. et al. Measuring mechanical tension across vinculin reveals regulation of focal adhesion dynamics. *Nature* **466**, 263–266 (2010).
281. Dupont, S. et al. Role of YAP/TAZ in mechanotransduction. *Nature* **474**, 179–183 (2011).
- The authors reveal the role of the transcription co-regulators YAP and TAZ as central regulators of mechanotransduction in 2D culture, mediating cell spreading, proliferation and apoptosis, and differentiation in response to stiffness.**
282. Elosegui-Artola, A. et al. Force triggers YAP nuclear entry by regulating transport across nuclear pores. *Cell* **171**, 1397–1410.e1314 (2017).
283. Shiu, J.-Y., Aires, L., Lin, Z. & Vogel, V. Nanopillar force measurements reveal actin-cap-mediated YAP mechanotransduction. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **20**, 262–271 (2018).
284. Oria, R. et al. Force loading explains spatial sensing of ligands by cells. *Nature* **552**, 219–224 (2017).
285. Hui, E., Gimeno, K. I., Guan, G. & Caliali, S. R. Spatiotemporal control of viscoelasticity in phototunable hyaluronic acid hydrogels. *Biomacromolecules* **20**, 4126–4134 (2019).
286. Hadden William, J. et al. Stem cell migration and mechanotransduction on linear stiffness gradient hydrogels. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, 5647–5652 (2017).
287. Jain, N. & Vogel, V. Spatial confinement downsizes the inflammatory response of macrophages. *Nat. Mater.* **17**, 1134–1144 (2018).
288. Jain, N., Iyer, K. V., Kumar, A. & Shivashankar, G. V. Cell geometric constraints induce modular gene-expression patterns via redistribution of HDAC3 regulated by actomyosin contractility. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 11349–11354 (2013).

Acknowledgements

The authors apologize for not being able to cite all the relevant publications in this Review due to space and reference limitations. O.C. acknowledges support from a National Institutes of Health National Cancer Institute grant (R37 CA214136), a National Science Foundation CAREER award (CMMI 1846367) and National Science Foundation grant MCB 2148041.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to planning, writing and editing of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

Supplementary information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-023-00583-1>.

Peer review information *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* thanks Kenneth Yamada, Jennifer Young, who co-reviewed Martin Kiwanuka, and the other, anonymous, reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.

© Springer Nature Limited 2023